Manitoba Constitutional Task Force

January 31, 1991
Dauphin, Manitoba

No. 1

Chairman: Professor Wally Fox-Decent

91-05024/ -

MANITOBA CONSTITUTIONAL TASK FORCE

Thursday, January 31, 1991

TIME — 1:30 p.m.

LOCATION — Dauphin, Manitoba

CHAIRMAN — Professor Wally Fox-Decent

Members of the Task Force present:

Mr. James Carr (Member for Crescentwood)

Ms. Jean Friesen (Member for Wolseley)

Mr. Oscar Lathlin (Member for The Pas)

Hon. James McCrae (Member for Brandon West)

Hon. Darren Praznik (Member for Lac du Bonnet)

Mrs. Shirley Render (Member for St. Vital)

Support Staff for the Manitoba Constitutional Task Force:

Professor S. Gallagher, Research Director

Kathleen Mico, Research Officer

Terry Simmonds, Research Officer

Vic Toews, Legal Counsel

Witnesses:

Tom Alcock, Private Citizen

Arnold Zihrul, Private Citizen

Tena Alguire, Private Citizen

Trudi Gunia, Private Citizen

Wilf and Lou Hudson, Private Citizens

Charles O'Rourke, Private Citizen

Gordon Ritchie, Private Citizen

Richard Halliburton, Private Citizen, and on behalf of Ernest Riddell, Private Citizen

John Kalinsky, Private Citizen

Lou Lapointe, Labour Coordinating Committee

Alex Simpson, Private Citizen

Wesley Saari, Private Citizen

Debby Sorochynski, Private Citizen

Rae Tigg, Parkland Status of Women

Jim Donald, Private Citizen

Dan Jamieson, Private Citizen

Marion Campbell, Private Citizen

Bill Bassett, Private Citizen

Jim Wynes, Private Citizen

Dean Lawryniuk, Private Citizen

Heather Oberlin, Private Citizen

Fred Luke, Private Citizen

Matters Under Consideration:

Public Presentations—Manitoba Constitutional Task Force

* * *

* (1340)

Mr. Chairman: We are just a bit late starting, ladies and gentlemen. We are waiting for two of the Members of the task force to make their way up and take their places, and as soon as they are here we will begin.

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the first public hearing of the Manitoba Task Force on Constitutional Reform. It is a great pleasure to be here in Dauphin. We look forward to hearing from people in Dauphin and the Dauphin area this afternoon and this evening.

I hope you will have had a chance to have a look at our pamphlet, ladies and gentlemen. It attempts to give you a brief description of what our purpose is and the kinds of things we would be interested in hearing from you.

To put it in the proverbial nutshell, our mandate is to look at the future of Canada and the future of Manitoba as a province within our country, and anything that is relevant to that subject is relevant for you to share with us as participants in this process. We have given you a few suggestions within that very broad subject area of matters that will be of interest to us, such as the question of rights; the rights of our aboriginal people; the unfulfilled aspirations of our aboriginal people; rights of women; rights of other groups within the society of Manitoba and Canada; the question of power, what is appropriate for the central Government, what is appropriate for the provincial Governments, the division of powers; the matter of institutions at the national level, in particular the Senate and the future of the Senate, how it should be chosen, how it should be structured, what its

functions should be.

Those are the kinds of issues that we would be delighted to have you speak to us about, but understand please that it is nothing less than the future of our country that we are in fact considering in this Constitutional Task Force process.

I would like to introduce my colleagues on the task force who are with me this afternoon, and I will do so in alphabetical order. On my immediate left is Mr. Jim Carr, the Member of the Legislature for Crescentwood and the Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party. On my far left is Ms. Jean Friesen, the Member of the Legislature for Wolseley. On my far right is Mr. Oscar Lathlin, the Member of the Legislature for The Pas. On my immediate right, the Honourable Jim McCrae, Member for Brandon West. Mr. McCrae is also Minister of Justice and holds a number of other portfolios in the Cabinet. On my left, in the middle, the Honourable Darren Praznik. Mr. Praznik is the Member of the Legislature for Lac du Bonnet, Minister of Labour and holds other portfolios in the provincial Cabinet. Finally, Mrs. Shirley Render who is on my middle right. Mrs. Render is the Member of the Legislature for St. Vital. My name is Wally Fox-Decent, and I am Chair of the task force.

* (1345)

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure to begin the process of hearings now. The rules are simple. When your name is called, we would ask you to be kind enough to come forward and sit at the table. Speak into the microphone so your words can be heard and also recorded. All of the testimony, the words of our participants, will be recorded and printed as they come out day by day. There will be a daily Hansard printing of the public hearings process, so we would very much like you to be heard and be recorded. If you would speak into the microphone, that will help.

There is a 20-minute time limit on speeches. We will give you a signal after 15 minutes that you have five minutes left. We would ask you if you would please be good enough to conclude your remarks when we give you the signal that the time has elapsed to 20 minutes. Then there will be a period for Members of the task force to ask you some questions, to share with you some back-and-forth in terms of question and answer. That will last up to 10 minutes. In some cases, there are very few questions or none. In other cases, the Members of the task force will feel that they would like to explore further some of the ideas you have expressed to us.

The gentleman on my left who is interpreting in American Sign Language is obviously for the purpose of any of our guests who are hearing impaired. The proceedings are being translated from English to French and vice versa where French is being spoken.

May I now invite the first presenter of this afternoon, Mr. Tom Alcock, to come forward. Mr. Alcock lists himself as private citizen.

Mr. Tom Alcock (Private Citizen): Good day. My name is Tom Alcock. I am a former welder, mechanic.

Mr. Chairman: Would you just—that is great, sir. We just want to hear you a little better if we may.

Mr. Alcock: I have been literally all over the country. You see my cap here. I have been on the DEW line. I have been literally all over the country. I have worked with the aboriginal people; I have worked with the Inuits. Some of these aboriginal people are very nice people to work with—very nice to work with.

The gentlemen over here, I have worked with some of his people up at The Pas there, on some of the jobs that I have worked on, dams up North. I thought they were very nice people.

On these cement floors, I have come down with arthritis. I had an operation on my back—12 screws later. They are an inch and a half long. The thing is, now my wife has a few cows to milk, and we are trying to make a living. I am on a disability pension of 570-some dollars, and, you know, just trying to get off the poverty line, stay away from being dressed on welfare.

Another thing you said, you heard that Joe Clark said that this country is rich on TV here the other night. I would like to know where he got that. Another thing that I would like to know, anything about the federal Government, get away from this ungodly—excuse the language—spending.

Now what did he give this $50 million to Mandela for and then turned around and gave it into U.S.? Now look what Mandela is doing with it.

Another thing, Russia, to give a bunch of food and one thing and another, and it spoiled on the side roads or some place like that. Do we need to help those kind of people out? You know, if they are going to look after it, we give it, eh?

Then Manitobans here, another thing, run around here and put up hospitals and one thing and another, spend all the money, and then turn around and have the nurses go on strike for a month. Does that sound feasible?

Now these here politicians all took 4 percent on their wages. What kind of money is that they are getting on 4 percent? Then they turn around and offer the teachers and the nurses 2 percent or a little more. You know that sounds a little senseless to me.

* (1350)

Then another thing, I have been taken on a segregation thing on a job at Limestone. I was there as a welder and mechanic, and they asked a lot from me where I could not do it. I was coming down with this arthritis standing on these cement floors, and I am on medication here now as well.

Another thing, I would like to give you people a document of what happened this summer here—and I need help—for feed. There is no feed program they have federally and provincially. Our cheques were held back at the Roblin creamery because we do not have enough cream quota. We only had 450. We had gone to the bank to borrow and no way, they said it was too risky. We did not get it, so we had to rely on borrowing and to get somebody who has a cream quota. They do not want to give it so that you could go buy on. They will keep it until July and these kinds of things. We ran out and now we are running out again and there is your 450 kilograms. I was going to try to get 600 kilograms from the Milk Board and I do not know—they do not seem to have it.

These things, if you do not mind here, you can keep them on your task force, and you can follow and see what has taken place. I hope I am not into unscheduled time. If anybody wants to ask a question on anything, I will try and answer it for you. I will try and answer these questions.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, sir. Are there any questions to Mr. Alcock? Thank you again.

Mr. Arnold Zihrul. Good afternoon, sir. Please go ahead.

Mr. Arnold Zihrul (Private Citizen): Mr. Chairman, Wally Fox-Decent, Honourable Members, Jim McCrae, Darren Praznik, Shirley Render, Oscar Lathlin, Jean Friesen and Jim Carr, my name is Arnold Zihrul. I was born and raised in this part of the country. It was 75 years ago that I let out my first holler, and I am still hollering. I have been farming in this area all my life except for four years in the army.

Anybody without a history has not a future, so you will have to bear with me as I remind the panel of a little bit of the major history of our part of Canada, Manitoba.

* (1355)

Canada's history goes back more than 25,000 years when the Asian Orientals crossed the Bering land bridge to occupy the northwestern corner of our continent. Shortly after, came the northern residents of present Europe. The two groups melded to become the present-day Inuit.

Reed boats from northwestern Africa floated across the ocean and landed in the Mexican area of today, also about 25,000 years ago. Some of the north-south groups eventually melded to become the first inhabitants of this continent.

Norsemen had sailed to our continent for more than a thousand years and kept this land and fishing secret for 500 years before others found out.

1496 - King Henry VII of England gave John Cabot and his three sons permission to seek our new lands for England. It is speculated they landed in the area of Cape Breton Island, southern Labrador or Newfoundland. For this, he received a grant of 10 pounds. He made a second voyage in 1498 and explored the area of New England.

1504 - A shore base was established for English fisheries at the present-day site of St. John's, Newfoundland, the first trespassers and squatters on present-day Canada.

1527 - Captain John Rut sent the first letter report of conditions in Newfoundland and Labrador to King Henry VIII on August 3, from St. John's.

1534 - Jacques Cartier sailed west, trespassed at Gaspe and claimed the land for France. The next year, he entered the St. Lawrence River and sailed as far as the present-day Montreal. Trespassing and squatters were set down.

1583 - Sir Humphrey Gilbert is credited with the start of the British Empire when he visited Newfoundland and proclaimed sovereignty over it.

1577 - Sir Martin Frobisher was the first to attempt the Northwest Passage and penetrated as far as Hudson Strait.

1610 - Henry Hudson sailed into present day Hudson Bay. The crew mutinied and set Hudson and eight others adrift in a small boat and were never heard of again. In 1612 Sir Thomas Button sailed down the west coast of Hudson Bay.

1661 - Radisson and Groseilliers secretly trespassed north of Lake Superior reaching James Bay, but failed to get French support. In 1668 they headed an English fur-trading voyage into the Hudson Bay. This led to a grant of a Royal Charter

to the Hudson Bay's Company in 1670 to a fur trade in all the lands drained by the streams that flowed into the Hudson Bay.

The Hudson's Bay Company respected the customs and traditions of the Natives by learning their language, abiding by their culture and doing business in their language. Alcohol was not allowed nor was cohabiting with the Native women. Nevertheless, some did marry according to custom and raised families. Some deserted when they returned to England and many stayed faithful.

One such was Peter Fidler who taught his children English and a trade. His son ran the trading post north of Dauphin while his father was ill. I might also mention that he is buried near the fur-trading post on the shore of Lake Dauphin here.

1690 - Hudson's Bay Company employee Henry Kelsey learned the language of the Native and was sent out with a group of them to explore and record the present day region of Manitoba and Saskatchewan. They were away for two years and the report was held secret, mainly because it revealed that this was an agricultural producing area probably. It was recently released when the owner died and his estate was exami

1713 - In the peace Treaty of Utrecht, France surrendered any and all claim of the Hudson Bay region, Newfoundland and Acadia to Great Britain.

1754 - Anthony Henday explores present day Alberta.

1759 - French defeated in battle of Quebec, and the next year British troops capture Montreal.

* (1400)

In the Treaty of Paris, France ceded to Britain all their possessions in North America except the islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon. French colonists were granted free transportation back to France. Only 300 of the 65,000 took advantage of this. Use of the French language was neither officially permitted nor denied.

1783 - Immigration of about 50,000 United Empire Loyalists changed Canada from a French-speaking colony to a predominantly English-speaking country.

1791 - The territory of Quebec was divided into Upper and Lower Canada by the "Constitutional Act" or "Canada Act" passed by the British Government.

1792 - First Legislatures opened in Newark, Upper Canada and in Quebec City, Lower Canada.

1837 - Louis-Joseph Papineau was defeated in a rebellion led in Lower Canada. That is the first of three rebellions that we have had in Canada.

"Act of Union" combining Upper and Lower Canada under one Government proved to be unsatisfactory. The Quebec Act of 1774 aimed at the permanent retention of Canada under British sovereignty with such full measure of recognition of the religion, the customs and the law of the French Canadian as should secure allegiance. Rebuilt into the later statutes of 1791, 1840 and 1876, its principles are still the basis of our commonwealth.

1857 - Queen Victoria names Ottawa as the national capital.

1867 - Union of Upper and Lower Canada with New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. Upper and Lower Canada were renamed Ontario and Quebec with the federal Government and Quebec to be bilingual.

1869 - The Hudson's Bay Company transfers their Hudson Bay watershed territory of Rupertsland for $1.5 million to Canada.

The first Riel rebellion and formation of provisional Government in present day Manitoba. On December 27 Riel declared himself president of the provisional Government. His purpose was to negotiate the terms for the entrance of the Red River area into the Canadian Confederation.

1870 - Manitoba enters Canada and Louis Riel was denied amnesty and fled to the United States. This would be Canada's third rebellion.

1885 - Gabriel Dumont persuaded Riel to return to Canada and lead the fight for the Metis' rights in Saskatchewan. They were eventually defeated. Gabriel Dumont fled to the United States and Louis Riel surrendered to the troops. He was tried and later hanged for his part in the rebellion.

1888 - The first provincial Premiers' conference was held in Quebec City. The request for more powers was refused by Great Britain.

1912 - The Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec boundaries were extended to the Hudson Bay.

1927 - The Privy Council decided in favour of Newfoundland in the dispute between Quebec and Newfoundland over the boundary between Quebec and Labrador.

1931 - The Statute of Westminster established the complete legislative equality of the Parliament of Canada and the United Kingdom.

1949 - Newfoundland becomes the 10th province of Canada and Canada permitted to make limited

amendments to the British North America Act.

1968 - Pierre E. Trudeau elected Prime Minister of Canada.

1976 - Rene Levesque elected Premier of Quebec.

1980 - In the Quebec Referendum on separation, 60 percent voted to remain in Canada.

1982 - Prime Minister P. E. Trudeau brings the new Constitution of Canada home to Canada.

Back to 1960 - In the spring of 1960 four men, Jean Marchand, Gerard Pelletier, Pierre Elliott Trudeau and Rene Levesque met in Montreal's Mount Royal Hotel to discuss the future destiny of Canada.

* (1405)

After four years of clandestine meetings in one another's kitchen, it was decided that Rene Levesque would remain in Quebec and J. Marchand, G. Pelletier and P. E. Trudeau would enter federal politics. Their mandate: To make Canada a French-speaking country coast to coast. A quiet revolution.

First, bring home the Constitution and amend it to make bilingualism in all federal services with Francophone personnel in place mandatory.

Next, French minority rights in provincial services and French language rights in schools. Then bilingualism in all provincial services, and eventually French only in all of Canada. The first step is already in place as Quebec is now a French-only province. Most influential positions in Government and many municipalities across Canada staffed by French personnel.

In my opinion, the Meech Lake Accord would have been one more step in this direction. The veto rights in the accord would stop any further amendments to the Constitution, the Senate or the Supreme Court. Slowly and surely, Canada would have become a French-only land. The Treaty of Paris, 1763, made Quebec of British possession and part of Canada; therefore Quebec is a part of Canada whether they have signed the Constitution or not.

Their heirs became British subjects and bound to allegiance and obliged to abide by the laws of Canada. If the residents of Quebec wish to speak French, so be it. By the same token, the residents of other provinces should have the same rights to legislate the language of their choice and not obliged to supply the French special privileges which they do not give others in Quebec.

Documentation in one language will in time make a mountain. Why have two mountains? Besides, something is lost in any translation. You can take a piece of literature, translate it from one language to another back and forth 44 times and in the end you will never recognize that it was the same one that you started out with.

The astronomical cost of double administration must stop. French is a dying language. French is not the only dying language. There are many dying languages, in fact some of the early languages have been lost forever. From about third place to now about mid-twenties worldwide, the melting pot of Canada is not a fertile place to promote the French language.

The French were among the most aggressive in promoting the language, cultural and religious genocide during the early colonizing period. They now have been expelled from most of their former colonies in Africa and Asia. The Quebecois' uncompromising demands for a francophone language supremacy in all of Canada cannot be tolerated. We must learn to treat each other with respect and dignity; a dictator cannot. Now the Quebecois have dictated a new set of demands: take it, no compromise, more blackmailer threats. Complete separation? Possibly never.

Are these legislators of Quebec in their unreasonable demands of the federal and other provinces an attempt to break up Canada? If this is the case, these traitors should be expelled from Canada. The division of powers between the federal and provinces appear satisfactory and should only be changed by secret ballot by all the legislators of Canada, by secret ballot. That means going right down to the level of mayors, reeves, councillors, all the way down.

The Charter of Rights may be examined and any changes must be approved by a two-thirds majority vote of more than 75 percent of eligible voters of Canada in a referendum. Multicultural heritage is being looked after by the individual groups and should not be tied down by laws.

English is the working language of Canada, therefore, it is now time for the Manitoba legislators to take advantage of the notwithstanding clause and make Manitoba "English only" in the Legislature and all municipal services in Manitoba.

* (1410)

Manitoba has had a most interesting past and the turmoil continues.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, sir. Any questions from the task force?

Thank you again and thanks for your written presentation as well, which we have, of course, received and followed as you spoke.

Mr. Zihrul: It has been a pleasure, thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Tena Alguire. We have your written presentation, Ms. Alguire, thank you. Good afternoon. Please proceed.

Ms. Tena Alguire (Private Citizen): Good afternoon. This presentation is a short one. I firmly believe this task force is redundant or our elected representatives are redundant.

You have been hired to do their work. It is a responsibility of each of our elected representatives to ask his or her own constituents about their needs or wants. Of course, if I had been asked to be a member of this task force, I would have jumped at the chance, so that I too could get a hefty slice of the pie. This task force is a needless expense for the Canadian taxpayer because, and I repeat, you are doing the work of our representatives, who were elected by us to represent us in Parliament.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you. Any questions?

Hon. James McCrae (Member for Brandon West): Thank you for coming today. Your brief seems to be making the point that the Members of the task force are not elected representatives. I just want to make it clear to you and everyone else that all of the Members, with the exception of the independent Chairperson of this task force, are Members of the Legislative Assembly, duly elected by the electors of Manitoba and representing all three political Parties.

I might just want to make sure that is clear in your mind, that electors do not just do their jobs sitting in the Legislature. It is a good idea to get out and listen to our constituents, and that is exactly what we are doing by this exercise.

Ms. Alguire: Why do we need the task force then when they can come out and ask us on their own? They have plenty of time. I do not see where we need this task force.

Mr. McCrae: Mr. Chairperson, I do not want to get into a debate. We are here to listen to what you have to say, and we respect what you have to say. I think it is also important to look back on the recent history of constitutional developments in Canada and to look at the part that Manitoba has played.

I think that if you look around the country now, you will see that a number of other jurisdictions are perhaps trying to take a leaf out of the book that Manitoba has written with respect to the Meech Lake Task Force. I think there was general agreement amongst Manitobans that that task force, an all-Party task force, which was composed of politicians and an independent Chair, in the person of Professor Wally Fox-Decent, that exercise was an exercise in democracy and an exercise of listening to the people who live in our province and being seen to be listening to the people.

So I make that point that this is a democratic exercise. The Meech Lake Task Force heard from many, many Manitobans and were told that they did not like the kind of constitutional evolution where only the politicians make the decisions without properly consulting the people. My point to you is, that is what we are trying to do by way of this task force as well.

Mr. Chairman: Any response, Ms. Alguire?

Ms. Alguire: I still hold with my belief.

Mr. Chairman: Any other questions? Thank you very much again.

The next presenter is Ms. Gunia, Trudi Gunia, private citizen.

Ms. Trudi Gunia (Private Citizen): That is Gunia.

Mr. Chairman: I am sorry. I was not sure.

Ms. Gunia: I was here for the Meech Lake hearings, and we got rid of that nicely. Maybe we can do something on this.

Mr. Chairman: We have your written presentation. Thanks very much, Ms. Gunia. Please go ahead.

Ms. Gunia: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Constitutional Task Force, I am here today, not solely out of concern for the content of our Constitution but, as well, because I feel that the dreadful state of our country at present is due to a lack of concern for the very people the Constitution sets out to protect. This is so, I believe, because of Government's lack of will to do what is right and good for the majority of the people, and I emphasize majority. With any number of issues and concerns to act as witness, we have seen the total disregard for the people by our present federal Government.

My first is constitutional justice for the aboriginal people, because they were the first people. Here I would cite six principles towards this beginning: Recognition of aboriginal peoples as the fundamental and original characteristic of Canada; recognition of aboriginal peoples as distinct societies, with protection for aboriginal languages, cultures, traditions and institutions; recognition and protection

of the inherent right of self-government of aboriginal peoples; recognition and protection of right to aboriginal title; the fulfillment of all treaties, including the land claim agreements, signed between the aboriginal peoples and the non-aboriginal Governments; the right of aboriginal people to participate as equals in the process of constitutional change.

On the Senate, one thing we do not need in this country is more leaders. We now have too many who cannot seem to get it right. Elected surely under Party banners, would embed federal-provivincial conflict in the national legislative process. Basing the Senate on regions may also be ineffective, because most Canadians do not identify with regions but rather with provinces. I am against Americanization of Canada's political institutions, and there is the strong possibility of this in advocating a Triple-E.

In giving the Senate this muscle, either the parliamentary system will be distorted, or Canada will experience crises and deadlock. It is felt by some learned citizens that a system of proportional representation, whereby Parties would be allotted M.P.s on the basis of their share of the popular vote in each province, would address alienation directly. Frequent minority Government might be positive for a country as diverse as Canada, as Governments would be required to seek regional and ideological consensus on an ongoing basis instead of just once every four or five years during an election campaign.

What Government does need is men and women elected to a strong national Government, and I emphasize strong national Government, who decide to become elected servants of the people because they truly care, not because of power, nor the fact that salaries and pensions are such as not to be obtained elsewhere. Let me be very clear that a process of restraint should start at the top, with the Prime Minister on down. I am referring to the recent raises they gave themselves.

Our Constitution should clearly set out that a leader is not to be rewarded for a job badly done as the Prime Minister has recently seen fit to do. If we had elected a minority Government in the last federal election, we probably would not be in the mess we are in now.

Gandhi said that the greatest crime against humanity is poverty. While we have many representatives for the people's concerns, we seem to be sinking deeper into poverty. Let us not mistake this with third world poverty, but rather Canadian style of the have and have-nots. Therefore, it is not necessarily a case for more representatives, only caring, productive ones with a people's agenda rather than a corporate one.

* (1420)

I think that it would be beneficial to include in the Constitution some format for a referendum process.

Redistribution of Wealth and Resources: I am of the strong belief that we now have a federal Government that is totally out of control. By this time you can see I am not a fan of the federal Government. They are plunging this Canada of ours into an abyss from which it may be hard to recover.

We are coming more and more in this society to a two-tier class system, the rich and the poor. It is an inhumane, backward policy that continues to reward the wealthiest and punish the poor, and it is a shame for a country like Canada so rich in resources.

We need a complete change in thinking that will bring about fair and equitable distribution of the resources of this country. Economic disparity of our provinces is due in large measure to political manipulation.

I said in my presentation to the Meech hearings, and it now becomes more apparent than ever, that this federal Government is abdicating its duties and sacred trust to the Canadian people. The free trade deal is an abysmal failure. We are seeing consistent cutting of programs and transfer payments to the provinces, and more attempts to harmonize with U.S. privatization is becoming the norm.

It would be a serious error not to have a strong clause in the Constitution as to Canadian sovereignty and opposition to any attempt to subjugate Canada to the adventures of or takeover by another country. Our social programs must be maintained and strengthened.

The Canadian market is being undermined by high unemployment, excessive taxation and high interest rates. As more working people are pushed into poverty, social programs are decimated to free up Government revenue to further assist the corporations and now to kill and be killed in the Gulf War. This is a disgusting policy. Corporate taxes will decrease by $300 million, personal income tax will increase by $4.67 billion. These figures will no doubt be increased as time goes on.

A wise man once said: "We have learned to swim like fish and fly like birds—when will we learn to walk this earth like human beings."

Our Constitution will not be worth the paper it is written on if it does not contain an undertaking by whichever Government to safeguard, maintain and strengthen all of our social programs, in particular, medicare. Our Constitution will be worth something if it imbues Government with the will to finally bring forth a taxation system that is fair and equitable to everyone. This is most important and can be done. It only takes the political will to do it.

Federal-Provincial Cost-Sharing: Successive federal Governments have over the last 15 years reduced their responsibility for the cost of health care, post-secondary education and equalizing regional disparities. Until the mid-1970s the federal Government paid 50 percent of the cost of health care and post-secondary education. This has now shrunk to approximately 25 percent.

As well, the federal Government, through service cuts and deregulation, has reduced the ties of Confederation through: privatization and closure of rural post offices; ending CBC regional services; rail line abandonment; Via Rail cuts; deregulation of air transportation; increased costs for RCMP services; free trade with the U.S.; transfer of agriculture support programs to producers and the provinces.

Regional Development: The federal Government has abdicated responsibility for a number of regional development programs. The Mulroney Government has refused to renew agreements such as ACCESS and BUNTEP programs, Cultural Industries Agreement, a series of Transportation Agreements including Churchill. This has meant job loss, reductions in investment, cancellation of training, apprenticeship and education programs.

I believe our Constitution is going to have to become more of an economic blueprint than anything, because the state of the economy is basic to all of our lives. We should not have to ask someone's ethnic origin or look at their colour in order to know that they need jobs, health care, education and, in general, a decent life.

Canada Clause: With regard to Quebec, while I would prefer Quebec to remain within Canada, I would have no problem with their right to self-determination as with First Nations. I feel that the citizens of Quebec have the same needs as the rest of Canada, and there is no reason why we should not be able to work with the working people of Quebec on common ground for economic equality. I have no problem with two languages, but I do not believe that it should become a prerequisite to obtaining work in the rest of the country.

On the issue of multiculturalism, I have come to some different thoughts than I have had in the past. Canada is comprised of many races and nationalities. We all enjoy the differences, the cultures and traditions.

I am Canadian born, of Polish origin, but I do not want my needs to be based on my ethnic origin. We all want the same decent living standards, and if they are in place for one, then they should be in place for all. With regard to immigration, I feel that we should first have the amenities in place. As well, availability of employment should be a large factor. Let us not make the mistake of using immigration as a cheap labour source.

Collective Rights: The Charter of Rights protects the rights of individuals against the community. However, I believe that as a society, we must strengthen and enforce our intolerance for racism in any form. This should be made very clear in our Constitution. We must have constitutional protection for collective rights. Trade union rights, as well as the right to collectivize property, will be superseded by individual rights. It is my belief that if we do not start to think collectively, that is, of the society as a whole, we will continue on this divisive path that is redundant to growth, both economically and morally.

Sexual Equality: Women must be guaranteed that no aspect of the Constitution can override protection for sexual equality in the Charter of Rights.

Amending Formula: The aspirations of all Canadians must be given consideration when making changes to the Constitution, and requirement of unanimous consent of the Governments to change the Constitution is consistent with the equality of the provinces. In the case of addition of new provinces to Confederation, it is logical for the provinces to desire a voice in the creation of new provinces or boundary changes.

I am still having trouble with expansion of unanimity. It is rather hard to predict what we may be debating in the future and, in some cases, it may be imperative to have unanimity of the whole.

Finally, I appreciate this opportunity to come before you today to present my proposals for the Constitution. I apologize if I have repeated myself, but I did so because I have very strong feelings on the particular subject, for example, taxation policies.

It is my hope that this will not be an exercise in

futility and that my thoughts and suggestions will be taken seriously. I felt that the Meech Lake Task Force did a good job, but Elijah Harper was excellent.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you very much, Ms. Gunia. Questions from the task force.

Mr. James Carr (Member for Crescentwood): Thank you very much for a thoughtful and excellent presentation.

Running throughout your presentation, you talk about redistribution of powers and the importance in Canada to have a strong central Government to make sure that there is a minimum standard of service from coast to coast.

Much of the debate that we are embroiled in now has to do with the distribution of powers as between Canada, the Ottawa Government and all of the provinces. There is really a wide difference of opinion on whether or not there ought to be more powers given to the provinces or not.

What is your opinion? Do you think that the distribution of powers is about right now? Would you like to see more powers go to the provinces, and if so, which ones? How do you think we can best ensure that there is a redistribution of wealth in our country?

Ms. Gunia: As far as power to the provinces, if it means by the federal Government giving power that it is going to be whittling away at their responsibility, like regarding transfer payments and so on, I do not want to see that happen. I do not know if the provinces want that kind of responsibility. I would say I do not feel there is anything terribly wrong with the way it was in the past.

Mr. Carr: Do you see that all of the provinces across the country ought to be treated the same way in regard to the distribution of powers, or in your vision of the new Canada in the next century, can you see making an exception of the Province of Quebec? Do you think that there are special circumstances in Quebec that would entitle it or not entitle it to special powers?

Ms. Gunia: I can see them getting very excited about language. Like I was stating in my paper, I think their needs are basic, the same as ours. There are people who are hungry, who are homeless there, who need jobs. Probably the languages and their culture—well, there are other cultures in this country, but that is different.

* (1430)

I do not know, I have come to the point that—I used to feel that, no, Quebec must stay within this country to keep it as a whole, but I do not think you can force a province to do that. If they decide to become a separate nation, then that is their right to do so. I do not think that it is going to split the rest of Canada up or be a big disaster. Like I say, I think we can work with the people of Quebec. It just takes the will to do it, and we all want the same thing basically.

Mr. Carr: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Any other Members of the task force?

Mr. Oscar Lathlin (Member for The Pas): I too would like to commend you for your thoughtful presentation. It clearly spelled out very clear to me—I was going to ask you a question on the Senate. Somewhere in your notes here you say—and I think you have answered Mr. Carr's question on the distribution of power, whether we should maintain a strong central Government in order that the responsibilities from the federal Government are not offloaded onto provincial Governments.

I presume, when you say that, that you are talking about regional disparity and so on, some have-not provinces and so on.

Ms. Gunia: Yes, for instance the Maritimes, taking into consideration the situations in each province.

Mr. Lathlin: So that is why you are opposed to decentralizing more power to the provinces?

Ms. Gunia: That is one of the reasons, certainly.

Mr. Lathlin: Okay. My second question had to do with the Senate. When I read your notes, you say we have enough leaders already and we do not need any more leaders?

Ms. Gunia: I think we need workers.

Mr. Lathlin: I agree with you. Do you think that there is any use or purpose, any function, that is useful if the Senate were to remain, whether as is now or in a reformed way? Do you see the Senate serving a useful purpose?

Ms. Gunia: Well, take the example of the GST. I was hoping and praying that they could do something to stop it, but then Mr. Mulroney came along. He got his extra fellows in there, whatever happened, and did not work for us. If they really serve no useful purpose, as far as bad legislation, or whatever, you know. They can hold something up, but nothing constructive comes out of it in the end, or it can be stopped. I really do not see the purpose for them. Besides, they are a big expense to us.

Mr. Lathlin: Thank you very much.

Ms. Gunia: You are welcome.

Mr. Chairman: So you are in favour of ending the Senate?

Ms. Gunia: I think so.

Mr. Chairman: Any other questions for Ms. Gunia? Thank you very much, Ms. Gunia.

Ms. Gunia: Thank you for having me.

Mr. Chairman: Wilf and Lou Hudson, Mr. and Mrs. Hudson. Good afternoon.

Mr. Wilf Hudson (Private Citizen): Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: We have your submission, Mrs. and Mr. Hudson, in written form. Thank you. Please proceed.

Mr. Hudson: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Members of the task force, for giving us this opportunity to appear before the Manitoba Constitutional Task Force.

One would expect, Mr. Chairman, that you will hear a number of the same arguments that you heard when you were conducting the hearings on the Meech Lake Accord, but even though this may be so, we think that it is important for Manitobans to have a dialogue on the Constitution before changes are proposed so that this time the opinions of ordinary citizens can be taken into account.

I also would like to say, I think it is valuable that we have some dialogue back and forth, as well as just hearing from us. I think the people of communities such as this like to hear from the politicians, and this is an excellent opportunity for us to hear from you on what your opinions are about this.

We believe that what is contained in a Constitution should be for the good of all Canadians rather than, as is sometimes the case, used as a barrier to prevent positive action. We realize that this is an oversimplification, but there are a couple of examples to make the point.

If you look back to the 1930s, both Prime Ministers, W. L. Mackenzie King and R. B. Bennett, took the position that, since relief—now referred to as social assistance—was a provincial responsibility, federal money would better be spent trying to balance the budget rather than trying to alleviate the needs of thousands of unemployed people.

More recently, we have seen some employers attempting to use the Constitution to deny workers their right to collective bargaining. While the Charter of Rights protects the rights of individuals, we feel that collective rights should also be given some specific protection to provide a better balance between individual and collective rights.

Since the Second World War, the number of systems including health care, unemployment insurance and social assistance, you could go on, Canada Pension Plan and a number of other areas of federally initiated assistance and things that have helped in keeping this country together have been put in place, that made us very different from our neighbours to the South. Collectively, we are a more caring society. We thought our safety nets were firmly established, safety nets that are so important if we are to keep this huge country together. It is absolutely necessary that we pool our resources from sea to sea to sea to keep this nation viable. We want a country that cares and can demonstrate that we believe in relatively equal economic opportunities, educational advantages, health care, unemployment protection and access to communication systems. We will briefly comment on these issues.

Economic opportunities, we must reverse the trend that allows the marketplace to wholly determine our economic future. The Government must show that the jobs it creates are for Canadians in Canada, not for workers in North Carolina or Mexico.

The Free Trade Agreement is the single most harmful agreement a Canadian Government has ever put in place. It will do more harm to our country than we can at this time imagine. It affects our national pride, because we are less able to make economic decisions and other decisions such as how much gas and oil, to use one example, we must sell to the United States of America. It hampers us in the way our Government can provide for economic expansion in areas of Canada that require such assistance to create employment or other economic necessities. While the Free Trade Agreement may not directly be a constitutional matter, it certainly must be addressed when we are talking about how we are going to have a united Canada.

Health care, when medicare was established in the 1960s, the federal Government provided 50 percent of the costs in each province. Since the mid-1970s, successive federal Governments have reduced their share to about one-third. I do not know the precise number, but I know it is at least that low. I am sure that you will agree that this reduction will lead to unequal health care across Canada. How can the tax base of a Manitoba or Newfoundland provide the

same finances for these medical needs as those of an Alberta or Ontario? Surely, the health care of a nation's people is so important that federal Government should not be allowed to balance its budget at the expense of the sick. Canadians should have a guarantee that provinces, with aid from the federal Government, will provide care to a predetermined standard.

* (1440)

In communications recently, we have witnessed our federal Government slash millions of dollars from the CBC budget. As a result of this, a number of cities have lost their CBC TV stations. Because Canada is a large, sparsely populated country, we need a publicly owned and operated network of radio and TV stations to link communities together. Public broadcasting is not directly again a constitutional matter but surely is an important part of our Canadian society. We are already flooded with American magazines, books and TV channels, not to mention American programs on our own Canadian channels. A balance must be attained by developing more Canadian programming and making it available to all Canadians.

I would like to ask Lou to continue.

Mrs. Lou Hudson (Private Citizen): We will now turn our attention to the Senate. I would guess that over 90 percent of Canadians feel that some changes must be made to the Senate, although there is some disagreement regarding what form those changes would take. As we all know, the Senate is composed of 112 patronage appointees, 104 of whom are apportioned to the various provinces as follows: The Maritimes, 24—which breaks down to Nova Scotia, 10; New Brunswick, 10 and Prince Edward Island, four. Quebec, 24. Ontario, 24. The western provinces, 24—that is six each. Newfoundland, six. Yukon, one. The Northwest Territories, one. The additional eight recently appointed were drawn equally from the Maritimes, Ontario, Quebec and the western provinces.

One original function of the Senate was to protect regional interests, but because of political rivalry between the Liberals and the Progressive Conservatives, nowadays votes on controversial issues tend to be made on Party lines rather than reflecting opinions of persons in the regions or provinces. Because the Senate is not often in the news, 1990 being an exception, many Canadians are not aware of the extent of the powers which may be exercised by that body. For instance, Bills passed by the House of Commons must pass three readings in the Senate. The Senate may veto any Bill originating in the House of Commons. These are extraordinary powers considering senators are appointed and not accountable to a constituency. Since we believe that the Senate is vested with too many powers for a body comprising appointed Members, our preference is to have the Senate abolished.

Some people support the idea of a Triple-E Senate, an elected body with effective powers and equal representation from the provinces. We have not read any accounts of how this would work in practice. The concept sounds fine until one tries to come to terms with the powers to be granted to the new Senate. It seems to us that as elected people, the new senators would wish to exercise their legislative authority on an equal basis with the Members of Parliament, a recipe for chaos. Although we are philosophically opposed to the GST, we were absolutely disgusted by the cynical opportunistic tactics of the Liberal senators in their feigned opposition to the GST. If you thought that was bad, can you imagine what it would be like in a similar situation if senators were elected? Why compound the problem? Let us simply abolish this expensive anachronism that contributes little to the political process.

Regarding the aboriginal peoples of Canada, we support the position that the Constitution should include a clause which recognizes them as the first peoples of Canada to indicate that we acknowledge the fact that they were here first. Furthermore, we support the contention that the aboriginal peoples should have a full voice in matters of constitutional change.

Before closing, we would like to comment on the crisis Canada now faces with respect to the desire of the majority of the population of Quebec to begin a new relationship with the rest of Canada whether through separation or sovereignty-association. With the lack of firm leadership, indeed with the lack of a commitment to Canada as a nation, the present federal Government cannot be trusted to steer our country through this critical period. We find it difficult to be optimistic about the future of our country when our Prime Minister has already demonstrated, by the Free Trade Agreement and his readiness to follow the U.S.A. into war, that his commitment is to the United States and not to Canada. We need at this time a new national leader who will speak forcefully on behalf of Canada both domestically and internationally.

Mr. Chairman: Thanks to both of you. Questions

now—Mr. Praznik.

Hon. Darren Praznik (Member for Lac du Bonnet): Mr. and Mrs. Hudson, I am interested in just a little clarification or to pursue a little further with you your comments with respect to medicare and federal funding for medicare through transfer payments.

Obviously the reason why medicare or the health system traditionally was based under provincial jurisdiction had to do with, as you are well aware, that hospitals traditionally were local affairs organized by private groups like Grey Nuns, for example, St. Boniface, local hospital authorities and hospital boards.

Needless to say, in the last 30 years, our system of medicare has expanded greatly, I think to everyone's benefit. The relative cost of delivery has grown obviously to all our benefit, and the financing, of course, has become a major component of our spending as a community, in essence through our tax dollars.

What has not obviously changed is the division of powers and financing that affects that. My question to you in just asking that issue, do you think it would be wise for all of us as legislators, nationally and provincially, as we discuss the Constitution, to really do a thorough review of our divisions of powers to update and modernize that division to reflect where funding sources are coming from, given the changes that have taken place in Canada on a variety of issues over the last two or three decades, as opposed to living with the current division of powers and the fights that go on because money comes from one level for something that is being delivered in another jurisdiction. I am just curious in your thoughts, if you would recommend to us that we should do that kind of thorough review of powers?

Mr. Hudson: Well, first of all, let me touch on medicare. We talked about the expense of it, and I think most people are aware that in providing Canadians with 100 percent coverage, we are providing it 2 to 3 percent cheaper than the GNP of the United States where they are providing it to maybe 75 or 80 percent.

Let us recognize something else, that the health care of Manitoba at least, we talk about the private hospitals. Really they are still private hospitals but publicly financed. It is not really a nationalized health scheme in that respect.

As to division of powers, I believe that it was reasonable and promoted as one of the best health care schemes around the world when it was put in place. I believe that was carried on for some period of time. We run into the problem, I think, when the Trudeau Government started going to block funding. I do not mean to go through the history, but I am trying to collect my thoughts as I am going through this too, to answer your question more specifically.

I believe that, as we have said in our brief, it is obvious that if we are going to prevent extra billing, where there are provinces who would like to eliminate that, we are going to have to have a strong central Government funding in order to keep that in place because constitutionally the federal Government does not really have the authority to do that. The only way they can do that is through the purse strings. That is the only means that they can do that.

I believe that the health care system—and I alluded to that although we did not elaborate on it in our brief—the health care of the nation should be in some way enshrined in the Constitution so that it will be provided from a strong central funding, not so that politicians can play with it to balance their budget.

* (1450)

That was the point we were making, and I would reiterate that. I do not know that it requires a larger examination. I think that there are a number of experts around the country, around the world. We have had a health care scheme in place now for some 20 years. Surely, we do not really need to examine it, but I think we need to re-emphasize or to reshift the responsibility of the financing back centrally if we are to maintain a national health care scheme.

What is happening now, in my opinion, is eroding it quickly where we will not have a national health care scheme. We may have some kind of a health care scheme, but it sure as hell will not be national. It will be two- or three-tier.

Mr. Praznik: I appreciate your comments, Mr. Hudson. I guess there are other issues, too, where circumstances have changed over the last number of decades, as I am sure you appreciate, where responsibilities that were put in the hands of provinces in 1867 have, because of those financial reasons that you raise—now the federal Government has a greater interest in terms of the financing and delivery of those programs.

So I am just trying to get a general sense. Is it maybe time that we look at the division of powers and re-evaluate in our Constitution where those powers should be, in the provincial level, federal, or whether

it be the financing of health care, to be a federal power or federal responsibility as opposed to—as you indicated here today, provincially the feds control by the purse strings. So I am trying to appreciate if you are suggesting maybe it is time we do that kind of thorough re-evaluation.

Mr. Hudson: Well, first of all, I think that we need leadership that has a national vision of this country. I really think that we are sadly lacking in that. I am really concerned about that. I do not say that necessarily from a political bias. I say that, in general, we seem to be seeing the agenda being led by those who would divide this country rather than those who would hold it together. That is one of my really, very much, strong concerns.

Insofar as the re-examining of the funding, I am not one who believes that we should be dividing the funding, because once you start dividing the funding into provinces, you then start to lose the ability to have a strong central Government. So, therefore, there may be some necessity to re-examine the way of funding. I am not an economist and do not really feel competent to answer in the way where it needs re-examining, but I certainly have strong feelings that we need to have a strong and well-funded federal Government in order to see that those have-not or less-than-rich provinces have an equal ability to look after themselves the same as the others.

Mr. Praznik: Yes, I guess to not beat around the bush, would it be a good thing in your opinion, in a redrawn Constitution, to make health care a federal responsibility which would give it firmly that national, central position that you refer to as opposed to having responsibility, either divided or solely, in terms of the Constitution in the provincial sphere?

Mr. Hudson: Yes, that is what I was alluding to when I said I believe that it needs to be a constitutional matter if it is to be maintained.

Ms. Jean Friesen (Member for Wolseley): Mr. Chairman, I had a couple of questions. The first one follows on from what Mr. Praznik was saying.

You have commented particularly on the need for a strong central Government, particularly the importance of equalization and redistribution of income, but I wonder if you could also comment in the same vein on another area that is in crisis, and that is education.

Would you see or would you advise us to be looking at a much greater centralization of education, or should we be looking at a different structure of powers? I am thinking of education in the broadest sense, including manpower and training, and including not just financing but also standards. Do you have any thoughts on that?

Mr. Hudson: Lou is the former teacher-trustee, I will let her answer.

Ms. Friesen: Or advice.

Mrs. Hudson: I am afraid I have not given this area much thought, but the funding for the universities has been decreasing over at least the last decade and possibly longer than that. Perhaps for post-secondary, if you are talking about division of powers for post-secondary education and for other training programs, perhaps it would be a good idea if the federal Government were given that power instead of that being left to the provinces. I am sorry I am not really up on this so that I—

Ms. Friesen: You draw a distinction then between further education and secondary and elementary education?

Mrs. Hudson: Yes, I think I would.

Ms. Friesen: My second question is perhaps to both of you. I am sure you know that in the Atlantic provinces people are talking about a different kind of structure, perhaps moving away from provinces and looking at broader economic and possibly even political groupings.

I wonder what advice you would have for us or perhaps reflections of your own community on similar considerations for the West.

Mrs. Hudson: I would prefer personally to have the divisions be provinces rather than regions. I do not know about the diversity of opinion in the Maritimes, but in the western provinces, if you are including Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and B.C., there is a great diversity of philosophy and has been for the last 50 years. I am not sure what kind of a region, what kind of consensus you would get in a region. I think I would prefer to have the divisions remain as provinces rather than as regions.

Another reason for that might also be that when you get a little larger area, there might be more tendency for that area to want to set up its own country and once that starts happening to Canada, then I am sure there are going to be parts that are going to be looking toward the United States. The breaking up of regions and the great decentralization I would really not favour.

Mr. Carr: Mrs. Hudson, Mr. Hudson, you say many interesting things in your brief, and I would like to

isolate three of them and use that to formulate a question. You say you believe in a strong central Government. You say that you do not trust the current federal Government to take us through this critical time, and you say you want to abolish the Senate.

The obvious question then is how are we in this country to make sure that in a strong central Government with no checks and balances from the Senate that the political majorities of Ontario and Quebec will not dominate the rest of the country?

Secondly, how are we going to ensure that there is some check and balance against a federal Government with a large majority that does not take in the interests of many of the people who elected it or those who did not vote for it?

Mrs. Hudson: Mr. Carr, you seem to be assuming by your questions that the existence of a Senate would in fact act as a check and balance on a Government or on a House of Commons.

Mr. Carr: Actually I am asking you the question. What kind of check and balance would you like to see? We heard in the previous presentation that maybe a new political system, a new way of electing Members of Parliament is the answer through proportional representation.

Others say that a regionally balanced and elected Senate may offer the solution to that problem, and I am just wondering what your advice is since you believe in a strong central Government, but you do not trust this one. We may agree on that, but we have to look at the system as a whole to determine ways in which we can take the power of the strong central Government and give it the checks and balances that most people want it to have.

Mrs. Hudson: I do not really see an elected Senate as being helpful. Suppose Manitoba were divided up into, say, 10 geographical areas, each represented by a senator. No doubt the political Parties would all put their candidates into the field to represent those areas. Therefore, you would have senators elected on Party lines. I do not think they would be speaking for their region any more than necessarily the Members of the House of Commons. So what you would have then is another group of elected people who would want to exercise their muscle even more than they do now. Although they have considerable power, I think it would just be very confusing to have two sets of elected people. To whom are the people going to be turning when they want to put forward something about which they feel very strongly? Are they going to go to their Member of Parliament, or are they going to go to their senator?

* (1500)

I just do not see senators speaking for a region or for a province. I mean, all these people who are going to be elected are going to be Party people, and therefore, when they get in the Senate, there will be a majority of some Party, probably. Well, there could be a minority, I suppose, but probably there will be a majority and, therefore, likely the Liberals. If it were the Liberals who won for the senators, they would want to be supporting Liberal policies in the House of Commons. I mean, what are you accomplishing by this? Now I am asking you a question.

Mr. Carr: I am glad to answer it, but I would prefer to hear from Mr. Hudson first.

Mr. Hudson: I thought I was going to get the last word. Anyway, you seem to be talking about an elected equal Senate of some sort or implying that. I think if you want to use an example of that where they have equal senators for equal states, if there is parity across the United States, no thank you. I think the States, really as individual states, it certainly has not proven to be beneficial there where they have two senators for every state, and it has not proved to be any advantage there. I think that you do not have to just use the United States as an example, and I do not mean to do that in all cases, although it is a big neighbour and has a big influence on what happens to us.

I do not think an elected Senate is going to necessarily be the watchdog on issues. I think we have seen an example of the Senate most recently being a watchdog for a political Party rather than a watchdog for Canadians, and that is where my hangup is about having any three-E Senate, if you will.

Mr. Carr: Yes, but with respect, my question focussed in on your solution to the problem of no checks and balances, that to not offer according to your own analysis by an elected Senate. My question to you is: What are the checks and balances, since you want a strong central Government but you do not trust this one and you may not trust the next one, so what is the system that you feel you can trust?

Mr. Hudson: I think that we elect a Government—what checks and balances does the province have? The Lieutenant-Governor does not check and balance the Province of Manitoba. Surely you are responsible to the people of Manitoba, and if

you are not responsible to the people of Manitoba, then the people of Manitoba have the right to have an election. I really believe that a people who are elected and directly responsible to the people who elect them is a better check and balance than saying that we have this other second House who are going to be our check and balance. I really do not see them serving any useful purpose, and I really believe that a responsibly elected people should—and the group of them, 300 or so—be sufficient checks and balances within their own house through Opposition, et cetera.

Mr. Carr: I just want to be clear of what you are saying. You are satisfied then to give the Mulroney Government a free reign until the time it next meets the people at an election in spite of the fact that you do not trust the Government.

Mr. Hudson: Yes, I am prepared to live with our system without the Senate.

Mr. McCrae: I suppose, Mr. Chairman, that the discussion with Mr. Carr has basically dealt with some of the issues I was going to raise, but I could not help but smile a little bit when Mrs. Hudson referred to an elected Senate perhaps being a recipe for chaos. I sort of asked myself, what does she think we have now? There is very much dissatisfaction now in our country.

Mrs. Hudson, you and a previous presenter in reference to the Senate used the example of the GST. I do not suppose there is anybody in the country who wants to pay any new or different and certainly not more taxes, so let that be said right now. The GST is something that we feel pain in British Columbia and we feel pain in Manitoba and in Ontario and in Newfoundland.

So in the true sense the GST issue is very much a national issue. The proponents of the Triple-E model put forward their model as a way to deal with regional disparities, regional alienation and certainly a lot of Westerners are among those proponents of the Triple-E model. Aside from the discussion you have had with Mr. Carr about Party politics being part of the scene, I would ask you though, if you had equal representation, let us say for example from each of the provinces in the caucuses and in those Chambers in Ottawa, do you not think that there is a better check than what we have right now in that kind of a system? Do not forget the possibility of perhaps a Conservative House and a Liberal-dominated Senate.

I mean, using your own example of the GST, do you not think those Liberals in the Senate, if they had had the moral power of election behind them, might have had a little more of the courage of what they said was their conviction with respect to the GST in the Senate?

I put those ideas to you and ask you if you would like to make some kind of blanket response to it. I do think the example of the GST takes us away, just a little bit, from the more regionalized interests such as regional development and imbalances there, agricultural issues that we feel are very important out here in the West and, perhaps energy interests in the West as well, as distinct from a GST which is a Canada-wide national matter.

Mrs. Hudson: Well, I guess the point in our brief we made with the GST that although we do not agree with it, yet I do not agree with the idea that an appointed group should actually be able to block any kind of legislation that has come through the House of Commons, even though I do not agree with it.

To address your second point, when we set up some kind of an elected Senate, what would concern me is the primacy of the Houses. Who is going to have the last word? Who is going to set the agenda? Who is going to come up with policies on, say defence? So you are having a debate whether you should be going to war or not. There is one opinion in the House of Commons and another in the Senate. Now who is going to have the last word here? I see this as a real problem.

Once people get elected, naturally they feel that they have legitimacy because the people have chosen them. Here you have these two sets of people whom the people have independently chosen and both sets are going to want to have the last word, to be the one to give the final say. I think in the case—I had never thought of this before but—of some national emergency, if you had two elected bodies debating this issue, then where is it going to end up? How long is it going to take and so on? That is what I see as the main problem with having an elected Senate is, how are you going to divide these powers?

Mr. Lathlin: Thank you, Lou and Wilf Hudson. I think I have got three questions that I wanted to touch upon. The first one has to do with—you referenced the Charter of Rights, which sometimes conflicts with collective rights. I for one being an aboriginal person whose ancestors are signatories to Treaty 5—in an aboriginal community, things are done collectively, very communal, although that is slowly changing as

well.

I am also looking at the trade unions. Aboriginal people as well have been having some problems with the Charter of Rights although aboriginal people fully support the Charter of Rights because it protects individual rights as well.

I am just wondering because I have been dealing with that for quite awhile now. Sometimes you hear Indian reserves wanting to ban alcohol from the reserves, so somebody says, well, my individual rights are being violated then. I do not think that should happen, whereas the band council is looking at the collective rights of the community. My question would be: I wonder if you have any thoughts or views as to how we could balance or lessen the conflict between those two types of rights?

Mrs. Hudson: I will just give a brief response. I think there will always be a conflict or a tension between individual and collective rights, but I personally do not like so much emphasis on individual rights as opposed to collective rights. I will just turn it over to Wilf.

Mr. Hudson: Well, I did not want to interrupt. I do not think having collective rights necessarily disagrees with individual rights. I mean they are two things, there will always be some conflicts. I agree with you if a reserve or a community decides upon something, that collectively they have made that decision. There may be some objectors and the objectors have the right to object, but they do not have the right to rule.

* (1510)

I think that if a collective decision has been made such as in the trade union movement, which as you know is my background, a collective decision has been made and some people object, they have the right—for instance, in the trade union movement which is a little bit more flexible, I suppose in some ways more stringent in others—they have the right then to go and seek another union. Unless they can convince they fit more than 50 percent that they should have another union, then those rules apply. As long as the majority is in place and supports a decision, then the majority must have that collective right.

At the same time I think we have to be careful, and I do not think that this is any words of wisdom to you, Oscar, pardon me, but I think you probably already know these things, but I think we have to be careful not to tramp on individual rights in doing those things. It is a balance and all we are seeking here is a balance.

The reason we put this in that there should be a balance for collective rights is because if you give everybody individual rights, then there are no collective rights and nobody has freedom because everybody has the rights. That is what we are talking about is a collective right.

For instance, we believe that unions should have the right to collective bargaining. Some of the people who are in that collective bargaining unit may not support the union, but the collective are the ones who make the decision.

I think it is a matter of balance. It is not a matter of one superseding the other. As we see the Charter now, the individual rights supersedes the collective. That is what we are trying to say.

Mr. Lathlin: My second question has to do with the rights of aboriginal people to have the right to self-government to be entrenched in the Canadian Constitution as they have been trying to do since 1982.

How important, Lou and Wilf Hudson, or do you think it is absolutely necessary to first define aboriginal self-government, because that is what First Ministers have been saying since 1982, in view of things like GST, Meech Lake, the free trade. When we first started talking about free trade, Meech Lake, GST, I do not think a whole lot of Canadians knew the contents of those three items that I am talking about and also the implications of those three areas that I am talking about.

Yet when it comes to talking about aboriginal self-government to be enshrined in the Canadian Constitution, there seems to be a fear out there that we are going to have to define it first before we ever agree to sign a document that will give certain powers and authorities to aboriginal people. Yet we are still seeing the effects of free trade that nobody could ever predict. We still do not know what GST is going to do in the final analysis, but we went ahead with them anyway.

My question is: Why are Canadians having such difficulty in agreeing to the notion or to the principles of aboriginal self-government, because free trade right now is still evolving, the GST is going to continue to evolve? Not all answers were there on Day One for the free trade; in other words, it is an evolutionary process.

When I talk about aboriginal self-government, I look at it in the same light that it is going to evolve from the

time that Governments agree to entrench it in the Canadian Constitution.

I guess my question was, how important, or do you think it is absolutely necessary to first define it every which way before Governments agree to entrench it in the Constitution?

Mr. Hudson: It is a question that you have explained very well in putting the question. You have related to some of the concerns that I have, Mr. Lathlin.

I believe in self-determination, and I believe that the aboriginal people of this country have not gotten their fair share out of this nation that they should have historically. I agree with that. I suppose some other people share the concern about, what does self-government mean? I do not mean to say that when you are articulating what self-government means, or when you are drafting in the Constitution what self-government means, that you have to spell out every little detail. I mean, even in our Constitution things are only in general. A lot of things are not in there in detail.

We certainly have other communities within communities, like municipalities, having a self-government. Now, I do not know, does self-government mean self-nationhood? Those are the questions I have. That is the reason that I did not feel competent—and I do not know whether Lou did—to really get into that.

* (1520)

I have a lot of empathy for the problem having lived in communities relatively close to and having some understanding of how the people did not get their equal rights—to use that as an example—and certainly not equal opportunity. While I certainly am supportive, if I can put it that way, or sympathetic—I am trying to find the right word—toward self-government, I do not know how I would say to put it in the Constitution to do so.

Mrs. Hudson: I will just make one quick comment on this. If self-government had to be defined, then I do not suppose it would ever get in there. I really do not see any problem with putting that in the Constitution because probably self-government means different things to the Native people, say, in Manitoba, in Alberta, Ontario or Quebec. There probably is not any master plan for self-government. It just depends partly on the economics of the country in which the Native people are living.

I guess I would differ with Wilf a little bit in that I would say that I do not really see personally any problem in putting that in there. I certainly see a problem of having you define it before anything is put into the Constitution since it does mean, I am sure, different things to different parts of the Native peoples.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you very much. Mrs. Render, one more question and a quick answer, please. We have kept you too long and enjoyed it.

Mrs. Shirley Render (Member for St. Vital): Yes, I would just like to bring things back to the Senate. Now, am I speaking into this properly?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mrs. Render: You very correctly mention on page 3 that one of the original functions of the Senate was to protect regional interests. If you suggest abolishing the Senate, how do you suggest that regional interests would be protected, keeping in mind that our Chairman has said to be brief. It is an unfair question.

Mrs. Hudson: Although apparently that was one of the original functions of the Senate, I am not sure that—and I do not know my history well enough—it ever happened. Certainly, in the last number of years that I have been interested in politics, I do not think senators were looking after regional interests, and so if we abolish it, we are not losing anything in that respect. All I said was that I just could not see, since they would be elected as Party Members, them representing regions anyway.

Mr. Hudson: A quick short answer, I thought Conservatives believed in a fair day's work for a fair day's pay, and the senators sure as hell are not providing it.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. and Mrs. Hudson, I wonder if you would be good enough to think about giving us another short submission which you might send along to the office on this issue of the need to recognize collective rights in the Charter.

It is a very interesting concept and many Canadians are now beginning to think that there is some need to address the question of collective rights. If you would like to write us on that subject, whatever you might feel from your thoughts and whatever research you do, we would be delighted to receive that as a supplementary to your brief.

Thanks very much for coming today.

Mr. Hudson: Thank you for the opportunity.

Mr. Chairman: Our next presenter is Mr. Charles O'Rourke. Good afternoon, sir, and thank you for your written brief. Please proceed.

Mr. Charles O'Rourke (Private Citizen): Thank you. My remarks are general, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, as members of the provincial discussion committee, you have convened here today to hear what citizens of this province—

Mr. Chairman: Sir, excuse me, we are just not quite hearing. If you would not mind maybe pulling that microphone down a bit, the top of it, toward you. That is great, thanks. It will probably do better.

Mr. O'Rourke: Okay, how is that?

Mr. Chairman: That is better, thank you.

Mr. O'Rourke: You have convened here today to hear what citizens of this province have to say on the future of this province within the Canadian Confederation.

Many problems seem to have arisen in the past few years, particularly within the past four. The Meech Lake Accord and the political deal which many imagine preceded the convening at Meech Lake have been escalated to crisis proportions by the very Government which should have been defending the federal position.

I presume that most of you have read the position of the Quebec Government as outlined in the Allaire Report. This report would give the province of Quebec a total veto over the rest of the country, and the appeal to our Supreme Court would be denied by that province, thereby dotting the "i" with a vengeance. Manitoba should reject these proposals in their entirety.

Quebec—many people in Canada will have difficulty imagining this nation without that province. Many more will breathe a sigh of relief if that province should leave. There seems to be no option. The Prime Minister rolled the dice, and it appears he rolled up snake eyes. Personally I will regret losing the flavour which that province added to our national identity, but I will be relieved that the constitutional situation has finally crystallized. The terms are totally unacceptable and so it is good-bye Quebec.

A second problem follows on the constitutional settlement and will require some input from the Anglophone section of the nation. We need to maintain a through connection from Ontario to the Maritimes—this is, of course, if they do separate—both by road and by rail. We need the return of that portion of Quebec which was once known as Rupert's Land, and we need the negotiation with the people of that region to commence soon.

Such negotiation leads to the aboriginal people's claims. Most people wish a just solution to this problem but do not think that this situation can be resolved by the infusion of taxpayers' dollars. In fact most of us would like to have the sum total of monies spent in this direction toted up, beginning at the turn of this century until the present. Then with such a figure and considering the number of people involved, plus the state of their education at that time, 1900, plus their evolution into the present, we would have a better idea of what is needed.

Another item which needs to be addressed are the terms of our present Constitution and Bill of Rights. Pardon me, this is not quite clear. I believe it is detrimental to continue with the notwithstanding clause.

Mr. Chairman: Sir, once again, if you do not mind, we are just losing you a bit. If you could stay pretty close to that microphone, we would appreciate it.

Mr. O'Rourke: Thank you. I would have it abolished. The method existing at present which determine the rules for amending the Constitution should not, repeat "not", be changed. Meech Lake is not dead in the Prime Minister's mind and so, to achieve his aims, the method of changing the rules must be overhauled. My view of Meech Lake is that it would balkanize the nation even more than the departure of Quebec and, by reclaiming Rupert's Land, we can alleviate the splitting of the Anglophone provinces both east and west.

The bilingual state of the nation would, by any standard, be unnecessary, though it should be left in place but with easement in its application particularly in employment by the federal authorities.

Multiculturalism should be encouraged but without input of money from different levels of Government.

Before change is made in the nation, except in Quebec, we need the type of input which your Meech Lake Committee received from the people across the province. The Government should then be bound by that input and this could apply to other levels of Government.

At present we are governed by a party dictatorship in which the Party, through the Party Whip, lines up the policy in caucus and, by threat, removes the consciousness which is supposed to be the pro and con facing the Member. A good example is Kilgour in Edmonton. This type of operation requires the Triple-E Senate which should be able to give real second thought to the problems of the country and

should be able to listen to the voices of the population, though with more dignity than was evident lately.

Following the previous paragraph, another thought emerges which comes through naturally. It would be to the nation's advantage if Government displayed a higher standard of morality and ethics, and I refer to political appointments such as those made by John Turner and subsequently by Brian Mulroney. One case lately concerns the recent appointment to the Senate to break a deadlock which did not exist. Two of the appointees were people who had opposed the GST but were miraculously converted by the appointment to change positions. I doubt that the appointment was really legal as no deadlock existed in the Senate; the Liberals had a majority.

In the above context, that is morality, consider Rafferty-Alameda, and I have no further comment on that one.

While still thinking about morality and ethics in our political arena, we should look at the present system of pay and expenses with which our elected Members have presented themselves, also the pension system which seems to have outraged many of us. It smells.

* (1530)

On August 2 last year, Iraq gobbled up the emirate of Kuwait. I think that the entrance of our forces into this conflict should have been after Parliament had determined whether or not we should be there and after a free vote by Members. Perhaps we should enshrine in our elected Senate the necessary approval of foreign treaties or approval of this type of adventurism. Our ships being held at Gibraltar seems to indicate this necessary rule. Cabinet should have direct authority only on defence. Parliament should govern both Houses. War is not an adventure any longer and should be entered into only when necessary.

One other item comes to mind when I think of Governments. I wonder, in this day of attempted removal of deficits, despite hopping into a war, if we have too many elected representatives per capita. I realize that the Free Trade Agreement has cost the country many better-paid jobs and replacing them with lesser-paid employment, handling hamburgers, et cetera, or by UIC, but I think the country should consider the cost of an elected government, for when one totals the number of elected representatives across the country, the figure and cost across the country must be severe. We can possibly do it cheaper.

Concluding, I would hope that this province continue to be the keystone between east and west, continue to oppose decentralization of the nation, continue to ensure that federal authorities live up to their agreements and continue to consult with its population to help form sensible policy.

Where I come from, I was born in B.C., schooled in Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba. My father is of Irish extraction from Ontario. My mother was born in Scotland; my stepmother was born in Prince Edward Island. I served in the armed forces in the army during the Second World War, returned to railway service following the war, raised six children, had an interest in politics, but not in being an elected representative, and I am kind of shy about being up here today. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you very much, sir. Are there any questions?

Mrs. Render: One of the words in your presentation caught my eye here. I see you use our elected Senate. I gather that an elected Senate is something that you would like to see happen. Is that correct?

Mr. O'Rourke: Yes, I would. That is correct.

Mrs. Render: Mr. Chairman, another question if I may, how do you see the Senate being elected? How do you see the process actually taking place?

Mr. O'Rourke: I do recall a previous conversation with the previous duo on Senate. They were afraid that the Senate would be a replica of the House of Commons, particularly in its Party membership. I would offset the Senate. I would not elect it the same year as the Commons. I would elect it two years behind, or in some manner that would give the population some input to direct, and help direct, the House of Commons.

Mrs. Render: Thank you very much—very interesting.

Ms. Friesen: The earlier speakers also talked about the difficulties that one would encounter when the two Houses of Parliament might be deadlocked. What kind of response would you have to that?

Mr. O'Rourke: The outline would probably have to be more rigid in the rules that would apply to the Senate. For example, I cannot particularly see the Senate being allowed money authority, and then particularly when it means their own wages.

Ms. Friesen: So the Senate would have no power over anything which required federal spending?

Mr. O'Rourke: No.

Ms. Friesen: I see. So what kind of powers do you see for this more limited kind of Senate?

Mr. O'Rourke: Well, it could block or approve regional rights. That would be their position, and they would have to maintain that, but I would not want to set myself up as an expert on how that would be administered or addressed.

Ms. Friesen: So they would deal with regional rights, perhaps, but not anything which meant equalization or redistribution of monies?

Mr. O'Rourke: No, money would be the House of Commons.

Ms. Friesen: House of Commons, I see.

Mr. O'Rourke: The Minister of Finance, otherwise he will still be setting up an American system in which the Cabinet would not be really a Cabinet. You would have the House of Commons would be the same as the House of Representatives and the Senate the same as the American Senate. I do not think that is what you want.

Ms. Friesen: So you are particularly opposed to an American type of Senate, but a different type of—

Mr. O'Rourke: Not necessarily, it could evolve there, but I would prefer we stay the way we are in a sense but give the Senate enough power to do its job. It would be required to give a sober second thought. That is what it was set up for.

Ms. Friesen: Yes. I have one other question. I noticed you talked about multiculturalism, and we have not talked about that so far this afternoon. I wondered what you meant by multiculturalism. You talked about supporting it but not to the extent of putting money into it. I wondered what you meant by Canada is a multicultural country.

Mr. O'Rourke: Well, particularly in this community you have a large Ukrainian population, they maintain themselves and maintain their operation. They run a very successful program in maintaining multiculturalism or their own portion of it. I can see no reason why—for example, you have a large German population in Winnipeg. They could also put up some of their own money, rather than have to go to the authorities for money to back it. That is all I meant by that. I am all for multiculturalism. I like to watch it, and when I can partake I would but not fund it.

Ms. Friesen: Can I pursue that a little, because I think there are some changes in the way Canadians are thinking about multiculturalism? I think Dauphin is a good place to begin that kind of discussion. I think one of the origins of multiculturalism is in the 1930s when one of the Governors General said to Ukrainians in Manitoba in fact, by being better Ukrainians you are being better Canadians. Is that what you mean by multiculturalism in the 1980s, do you think?

Mr. O'Rourke: I am not sure of that one for an answer. I do not see anything in the Ukrainian multicultural programs in this area that stop them from being good Canadians. I guess I would have to say, yes, I will go with that.

When I was a boy, I was an altar boy. In serving mass for one priest I discovered he had to speak eight languages just to get by with his parishioners who were spread around in west central Saskatchewan.

Ms. Friesen: Multiculturalism for you then means the maintenance of many languages.

Mr. O'Rourke: It could be, yes. I have nothing against languages whether it be French, English, German or what.

Ms. Friesen: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Any other questions?

* (1540)

Mr. O'Rourke, just on the questions that Ms. Friesen was asking you about the Senate, I presume what you are saying is that you would want the Cabinet and Prime Minister to remain responsible to the House of Commons?

Mr. O'Rourke: That is correct, but the Senate would have a right to look at what came out of the Commons.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you very much, sir. The next presenter, Mr. Gordon Ritchie. Good afternoon, sir. You are coming without a written submission?

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Private Citizen): That is right.

Mr. Chairman: Which is fine, by the way—just confirming that. Please proceed.

Mr. Ritchie: Having been to some of these in my day, it is maybe a little bit different for me because I am not usually on this end of the agenda. At this time and because I have been interested in the constitutional foofaraw—if you want to call it—which is going on, obviously, the country is coming to a change.

It has been a long time coming, and those who have observed it knew it was coming. We are perhaps as a country close to what it was in 1843 when Lord Durham produced his famous report of two nations or two peoples warring in the bosom of a single state. Recently, we have had the Meech Lake Accord before us and the demands or desires of Quebec in

relationship to the rest of Canada.

As those who have read—I have not read it—in the newspaper about what the Liberal Party of Quebec has come forward with, I believe there are considered to be 22 recommendations which would transfer federal power to the provinces. I would just like to speak on what I think in this next decade will be the most important thing in Canada and that is our immigration policy.

Now whether we like it or not, come the 1st of April, that is April Fools' Day, the federal Government has introduced major changes on our immigration policy through secret negotiations with their counterparts in Quebec.

On December 27, the Honourable Barbara McDougall and Mrs. Monique Gagnon-Tremblay, Minister of Communications for Quebec, their respective people, introduced or announced the new immigration arrangement between Canada and Quebec had been worked out in principle. This is very important.

The BNA Act did give the provinces a bit of say in the immigration but in practice it was rarely used, I understand, and this is a very important, at least in my opinion, event in our relations between the provinces. Some of you may have remembered that in 1978, Bud Cullen, who was then Minister of Immigration, had an agreement with Mr. Couture on behalf of the Parti Quebecois then in power, and they had an agreement which was to give Quebec further authority in the immigration to that province.

Now as this was one of the very important parts of the Meech Lake Accord, it is a significant move by our federal Government and our provincial Government of Quebec to bring forward an accord which seems to me was in the Meech Lake agreement and which was turned down by the people of the country as a whole. The new agreement would give to Quebec precisely what it would have given under the Meech Lake Accord, had it been passed. Quebec wants control over immigration to Quebec not to enhance Canadian unity but to make Quebec a distinct society with a culture quite different from the rest of the nation. It wishes to safeguard the French-speaking culture while at the same time seems to support an immigration policy or program for English Canada based upon multiculturalism and the watering down of English-Canadian influence.

I shall quote: "' The Accord recognizes that the government of Quebec has exclusive responsibility for the selection of immigrants in the independent class. It assigns to the provincial government responsibilities for reception, and linguistic and cultural integration services, as well as economic integration services available to permanent residents . . . .

" ' The federal government is therefore withdrawing from these services and will provide financial compensation to Quebec so that the services it offers will be equivalent overall to those offered by the federal government elsewhere in Canada.

" 'Quebec is the sole majority francophone province in Canada. However, with a birth rate which no longer ensures the replacement of the generations, a negative migratory flow for most of the last decade, and a diminution of its demographic weight within the federation, the province is concerned with its demographic, linguistic and cultural future. Among other factors Quebec counts on immigration to help redress this situation.

" ' The primary objective of the new Accord . . . is to provide Quebec with better means to preserve its demographic weight within Canada and to ensure the integration of immigrants consistent with the distinct character of Quebec society . . . .' "

One of the problems is the percentage of independents in our immigration flow, where they will be.

" If Quebec is to receive 25 to 30 percent of the total, does this mean that all independents will go to Quebec, and English Canada will receive only refugees and family members?

"And conversely, does it mean that the total immigration intake will be governed by Quebec's ability to recruit the immigrants it considers suitable for its culture?

" For example, if Quebec can only obtain twenty thousand in a given year, will this mean that in order to maintain Quebec's demographic weight, the rest of Canada will be only entitled to sixty thousand, to maintain Quebec's twenty-five percent share of the total?"

So it continues: " ' The Accord equally recognizes the exclusive responsibility of the Government of Quebec with respect to the selection of immigrants destined to Quebec (save in the case of family class immigrants) . . . .' "

Mrs. McDougall is quoted: " ' The new agreement to be signed by the federal and Quebec governments will clearly give Quebec additional means of

recruiting immigrants and integrating them into Quebec society, while preserving the unity of the basic Canadian immigration policy.' "

"This arrangement is precisely what was contained in the Meech Lake Accord with one exception. The provisions of Meech Lake would have been enshrined in the Constitution and could not have been changed without Quebec approval."

However, under the new provision: " 'Federal employees working in the services affected will be given the opportunity to join the provincial public service.' "

"The new Accord may not be irrevocable, but if the services for the integration of immigrants into Quebec are transferred to that province, and most of the federal employees are transferred as well, it will be permanent . . . .

"In referring to the operational annexes . . . to the formal document . . . the governments of Canada and Quebec, 'will establish a list of reception services and of linguistic, cultural and economic integration services offered to permanent residents, from which Canada will withdraw in favour of Quebec, and set the amounts that will be transferred to the Government of Quebec as compensation.'"

It was pointed out that, the assumption that new immigrants to Quebec will be only one-third French speaking on average, and that the cost integrating them will be substantially higher and that the Government of Canada, as a whole, will pay for these.

"The purpose of this arrangement is to allow Quebec to discriminate by selecting immigrants overseas for assimilation into French Canadian culture. As the announcements puts it, the purpose is to maintain French Canada's demographic weight in Canada. Compared to what is expected in English speaking Canada this is outright discrimination.

"Why is it, that in Vancouver or Toronto, people who question the changing nature of their cities are labelled as racists . . . while people in Quebec who are implementing a racially oriented system are hailed as patriots? . . . .

"If it is desirable to preserve French Canadian culture, then it must be equally desirable to preserve the culture of English Speaking Canada. Why do we have two different systems with quite opposite objectives working within the bosom of a single policy?"

I believe it is time for us to speak out and that in the question of immigration, as in question of many other aspects, it is time English Canada had a debate on what they expect.

* (1550)

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, sir.

Are there any questions?

Ms. Friesen: I am sorry, but I could not hear you very well all the time. I wanted to clarify if I understood what you were saying.

French Canada is able to select its immigrants in order to intensify or preserve its French Canadian or Quebec nature, whereas English Canada is becoming more multicultural and is being forced to do that because of federal immigration policies. That is what you are saying.

Mr. Ritchie: That is correct.

Ms. Friesen: I wonder then perhaps if you could enlarge upon some of the comments you have made about English Canada. You called for a debate at the end about what English Canada should be or what it wants, and I wonder, could you tell us what you think English Canada should become?

Mr. Ritchie: Well, I think in immigration you have to think of two things basically. One is do you ask immigrants to join you or do you ask them to change you? Now there is quite a difference. When they join you, they accept the role of where they come to, and they leave much of what they had behind them hoping for a better life. In a general way, I think this is the best way for immigrants to come to a country. If they come to change you as the Chinese have come in Singapore, as the East Indians did in Fiji, I do not think that is a very good situation and fraught with danger of various races, it seems to me, demanding a measure even of self-government.

Ms. Friesen: Can I pursue this a little further? Immigrants should accept what Canadians are. Could you expand upon that and tell us what you value in Canada, what you think we are asking immigrants to accept? This is a country, which is like what?

Mr. Ritchie: Well, I think it has been a good country, is a good country, but we have to recognize that if we have a great many disparate groups and in small numbers all races are easily accommodated shall we say, but in large numbers, if that number is too large, my argument and concern is that for the last, it seems to me, 20 years or more than 20 years we have discriminated against western European peoples and as a matter of fact actively discouraged them. I see

here of one where there is a hundred-year-old grandmother from Hong Kong being sort of welcomed in while a young Belgian woman and a university degree is being deported, who presumably would be a valuable citizen.

Ms. Friesen: So one of the things then that you value about Canada, or English Canada, is uniformity?

Mr. Ritchie: Well, I think there has to be enough uniformity in any nation to bind it together. We can have lots of dissent or differences, but if it is not enough we will have a lot of disparate people.

Ms. Friesen: I think generally Canadians have looked at one of the things they value about Canada is diversity and particularly when measured against the United States version of uniformity. How would you look at that? Why would you suggest, for example, an immigrant come to Canada rather than the United States? What are the different sets of values in the country?

Mr. Ritchie: I think it is largely going to come—both of them are very attractive, let us face it. A lot of Canadians here what three years ago when the Americans opened up their border, it was a real rush to fill what 200,000 to 300,000 slots for Canadians. I do not know exactly what you might say, but I do believe that too large a disparate—but again there are different peoples around the world.

It is much easier to assimilate or to make with western Europeans than it is with your Third World country. It could take much longer for them to become part of the Canadian mosaic.

Mr. Chairman: Any other questions? Thank you very much, Dr. Ritchie.

I understand that Mr. Riddell and Mr. Halliburton are making a joint presentation. Is that correct, gentlemen? -(interjection)- Very good, sir, and you are Mr. Halliburton?

We have written presentations from both yourself and Mr. Riddell.

Mr. Richard Halliburton (Private Citizen, and on behalf of Mr. Ernest Riddell, Private Citizen): Yes. I am sorry about the writing, but I did not realize you people were going to get a copy.

Mr. Chairman: Well, it is perfectly legible.

Mr. Halliburton: Well, I think I learned it in university to fool the professors.

Mr. Chairman: Please proceed, sir.

Mr. Halliburton: Thank you. On the pamphlet that you sent out you wanted our views on several subjects. I am going to give you a brief answer to each of these subjects before I speak on the matter that concerns me most for Canada.

The constitutional priorities—any changes, additions, removals, must be agreed on by eight provinces, size and population not counting. This will prevent control by any one province.

The aboriginal and women's rights to be equal to all others. The recognition of Canadian multicultural heritage—every immigrant can use his own language, retain his heritage, customs, but all the schools, laws, et cetera, to be in English, but America, our biggest export customer and with the adoption of free trade, it is very important to the future of our country that we all speak English.

* (1600)

Division of power, federal and provincial, I feel it should be retained as is, but that all the industries should be run by the public—railroads, petroleum, gas, et cetera. I do not feel there is anyone elected that has the ability to run each special business.

I feel that Quebec should be refused to run everything in their own province, as proposed by Premier Bourassa on the 9th of January on the ten o'clock news.

Senate reform—I feel two Members from each province should be appointed, not elected, people in good standing, no special political following and similar to the high court of Canada, and that they retire at the age of 65.

Constitutional change—I covered it in No. 1.

Constitutional reform proposals—all provinces and the Premiers of the provinces should have a meeting, and at least eight of each province should agree on all decisions.

To get to the subject that I came here mostly for—and I will give you a brief history first, although it will not be as long as the man who was up here ahead of me. After over 100 years, Canada has a problem with one of the provinces wanting everything run on their terms and in their language, so first let us look back on the history.

The French were defeated by the English on the Plains of Abraham by the Peace of Paris in 1763 which ended the war between England and France, Canada was ceded by France to Great Britain. The Queen at that time decreed the French would stay and speak their own language. This is the way it was for many years. Why then all of a sudden does

Quebec want to have special authority, such as Meech Lake, and have all the Canadian laws, et cetera, printed in both languages?

This brings up another point in the history. England and France had a war called the Hundred Years' War, which you probably learned about in public school. Germany and France were involved in the First and Second World Wars, and I feel that this was caused in a great part by the two languages. They did not understand each other and they had trouble negotiating. The interpreters, although they changed one language to the other, what they say and what they mean can be different. You do not see Canada and the U.S. going to war. They both speak English.

All of this trouble started when Trudeau became Prime Minister of Canada. Through devious ways, he decided all of Canada would be bilingual including all of the laws, et cetera, and this was known as Trudeau's master plan. If you have read "Bilingual Today and French Tomorrow" by J. V. Andrew, it gives a clear picture of that plan. Next he must ensure that he gets the Quebec vote—very simple, spend millions of dollars on and in Quebec. Today Canadian taxpayers are faced with a monstrous debt incurred during Trudeau's time as Prime Minister.

What is all of this leading up to? Even Dauphin, Manitoba, has a Ukrainian bilingual school and each nationality and each province will be demanding the same thing—more money from the taxpayer. The Germans, the Chinese, the Polish, et cetera, are proud to be Canadians. They retain their language at home but they learn to speak English.

During the debate over the Meech Lake Accord, the French-speaking Quebecers said the English-speaking Canadians hated them. I was in the Air Force before, during and after the war, and I could tell you stories of the French hating the English. At that time, they had to learn English to become pilots. I was a pilot and they joined my flight and they said, after they had learned the English, they did not realize what nice people we were, that they had been brought up to hate us.

During my many years as a pilot, the control towers all over the world spoke English. Quebec wanted the pilots to speak French at their airport. They lost that argument. During the war, your ability to do your job was the top priority for your advancement. Today, your ability to speak French is now the top priority.

In conclusion, there are two ways that this can be solved. First, the people of Quebec can start being Canadians, keep their language to themselves and accept and respect the language of Canada which is English. Insist that all signs in Quebec be in English and French. If this is the way to go, we will need a Prime Minister to stand up to these people.

Second, they can separate, but they cannot claim a piece of Canada. If they wish to stay then they will pay a high rent for the land and pay their portion of the debt. They will receive no monetary help from the rest of Canada and have no restrictions on their borders. There should be a 10-mile corridor through the south of Quebec to allow us to move back and forth to the rest of Canada.

In ending, the Americans were faced with this problem in Spanish-speaking states. They said, no, that the language in America was English. They said we do not want all the problems that the Canadians are having with the French language. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, sir. Any questions from the task force?

Mrs. Render: Yes, Mr. Halliburton, you mentioned that you recommended an elected Senate or at least, I am sorry, an appointed Senate. Do you think that the people should be appointed by the federal Government or by the provincial Government, or appointed by whom?

Mr. Halliburton: They should be appointed, I would say, by the province, not necessarily the Government. The Government would have to control it, but I think to pick the best man for the job you have to look very carefully.

Mr. Chairman: Any other questions? Thanks again, Mr. Halliburton.

Mr. Halliburton: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Chairman: I wonder if Mr. Riddell would just stand up so we could give him a wave.

Mr. John Kalinsky, are you ready to come forward, sir?

Mr. John Kalinsky (Private Citizen): My apologies, I came late. I am not familiar with the proceedings.

Mr. Chairman: It is very simple, sir. Thank you for your written presentation which we have a copy of. We would be happy for you to share with us whatever you wish to say, either based on this or anything else, and then there may be some questions from the task force.

Mr. Kalinsky: Well, at best I can just read my small—

Mr. Chairman: Certainly.

Mr. Kalinsky: —presentation. I do not have any suggestions or recommendations. I just thought I would say what I felt or I feel sometimes. I am not good at writing, and you will have to excuse my diction and phraseology. I wrote this this morning, so it was kind of hurried.

To the Constitutional Task Force, I sometimes cannot help but feel bemused or even annoyed by the scenario of Canadians who state that they are Canada's first nations or inhabitants. The French people seem to say that they are the founding nations. The British seem to be the ruling people. If we are going to be bickering and demand special status and control over provinces or regions, I cannot help but feel as a citizen other than the big three that I am somewhat lesser of a person, and our present system sort of locks me into that idiom into perpetuity. Does it not make some of us Canadians feel as guests in our own home?

It is sad that our Government and leaders are so preoccupied with our historical past that it prejudices their leadership. I cannot help but admire our late and past Prime Minister, Lester B. Pearson, when he made the decision to adopt the Canadian flag that showed no favouritism nor bias or attachment to the past history but rather to the future for all Canadians. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, sir. Any questions? Thanks again.

Mr. Kalinsky: You are welcome.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any other presenters, ladies and gentlemen, that we do not have on our list for this afternoon? Any others?

* (1610)

We will be back here tonight to hear our second group in Dauphin, at 7 p.m., and we would be delighted to have you join us if you are able to. We look forward to hearing from another group of citizens and from, I think, three groups, individuals speaking on behalf of groups. We will begin at seven o'clock tonight and go until we are finished this evening.

We are adjourned for this afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you very much for coming. Good afternoon.

* * *

The hearing took recess at 4:11 p.m

After Recess

The hearing resumed at 7:05 p.m.

Mr. Chairman: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to our second public hearing of the Manitoba Constitutional Task Force, also our second hearing in Dauphin. We enjoyed the views that were shared with us this afternoon, listening to various people in and around Dauphin tell us their feelings and their views on the question of Canada and our province as part of this country. Some specific matters related to the Constitution were shared with us, and that is, of course, our purpose this evening, to listen to you on the subject of this country and this province, and where we are going from the end of January 1991 into the rest of the '90s, into the turn of the century.

I would like to introduce my colleagues on the task force, with apologies to those who were here this afternoon and have already been through the routine, but I do want to be sure that everyone here knows the Members of the task force.

I am going to start on my far left: Ms. Jean Friesen, the Member of the Legislature for Wolseley; next to her, the Honourable Darren Praznik, the Member of the Legislature for Lac du Bonnet and Minister of Labour; next to him, Mr. Jim Carr, the Member of the Legislature for Crescentwood, and the Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party in Manitoba. Going to my far right: Mr. Oscar Lathlin, the Member of the Legislature for The Pas; next to him, Mrs. Shirley Render, the Member of the Legislature for St. Vital; and, on my immediate right, the Honourable Jim McCrae, the Member of the Legislature for Brandon West and Minister of Justice. I am Wally Fox-Decent.

The rules for presentation, ladies and gentlemen, are very simple. When your name is called, we would ask you if you would be kind enough to come up and take your place at the table. Draw the microphone up as close as you can to your mouth; there are some difficulties in hearing in this hall. We would very much like the audience to hear, as well as ourselves, and please do not mind if we stop you just to get that microphone adjusted so that we can hear every word you have to say.

The presentation is for a maximum of 20 minutes, and you will be given a bell signal at 15 minutes and a second bell signal at 20, when we would ask you to conclude your remarks. Then there will be a period following that during which task force Members may wish to ask you questions.

I would like to call on the first presenter this evening, Lou LaPointe, who is representing the Labour Co-ordinating Committee in Dauphin.

Good evening, sir. We have a written text that you have given us. Thank you very much. Just proceed when you are ready if you will, please.

Mr. Lou Lapointe (Labour Co-ordinating Committee): We are very pleased to be here this evening to make our presentation to the Constitutional Task Force of the Legislature of the Province of Manitoba here in Dauphin, Thursday, January 31, 1991.

The Dauphin and District Labour Co-ordinating Committee represents 15 affiliated labour union locals with combined memberships of nearly 1,400 members. Our goals and objectives address the concerns that we share about the present and future status of our municipalities, our province and, yes, our country.

We appreciate this opportunity to speak with you about our Constitution. It is important to us as average working Canadians and Manitobans that we take a part in establishing what kind of document will form the basis for a very public policy that rules how we coexist as a nation of diverse cultures and heritage. Constitutional reform, then, is something that we as workers believe lends itself properly to open and public debate. Manitobans have a right to expect public consultation on such matters, and we applaud the Members of our provincial Legislature for realizing this to be so in developing this forum.

* (1910)

Our committee believes that Canada needs a strong federal Government that can deal fairly but effectively with the everyday needs of average Canadians, while at the same time addressing the external dilemmas that affect us as a nation. We would take issue with any reform that would take away the capability of the federal Government to create and deliver policy designed to benefit all Canadians. Universal health and medicare programs, for instance, should not be left to the political whimsy of provincial Governments.

Charter of Rights: Our committee supports the belief that future changes to our Constitution must not take away from the basic protections contained in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms for Canadians of all walks of life. The notwithstanding clause is a dangerous flaw that in itself pounds at the very foundations of the Charter's protective clauses. The rights and freedoms of Canadians must be enhanced through change rather than diminished.

Lifestyle Quality: Any reformation of our Constitution must nurture the extension of quality of life to those members of our society who do not presently share in the wealth of our nation. The best universal health care system that money can buy and accessible post-secondary education form just a couple of identified needs. The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and the National Film Board need strengthening so as to ensure the promotion and the fostering of national unity through truly Canadian electronic media forms.

Federal Policy: Public transportation policy designed to dismantle Air Canada and VIA Rail has virtually killed some of our national dreams. Continued attacks on Canada Post and our public broadcasting entity seem directed toward the de-Canadianization of our population. Cutbacks in unemployment insurance benefits, free trade agreements, both with the U.S. and soon to be expanded to Mexico, are an open attack on Canadian workers. Our Constitution should address the matter of full quality employment for working Canadians.

Meech Lake Disaster: Canadians want a Constitution that embodies a strong will to survive as a nation, not a document laced with omissions promoted by the political positioning that reared its ugly face during the infamous Meech Lake debacle. Workers' rights, aboriginal rights and women's rights all need to be part of a comprehensive constitutional reform package.

Senate Reform: Canadians from coast to coast, boundary to boundary, know that an elected Senate will form just another level of Government that will not address the needs of ordinary Canadians. The abolishment of the Senate is an effective approach to reworking our federal system so that it will reflect the desires and concerns of Canadians without the interference of yet another level of politically appropriate Party hacks.

House of Commons: Representation by population has not been the answer for the political representation that is seen to be fair and equal across this vast country of ours. The hue and cry from Canadians not living in central Canada has been for a new form of regional representation in our House of Commons. Let us look then toward the consideration of a system of representation that departs from the historically unfair. Let us build a new structure

together in co-operation with Canadians coast to coast.

Labour: A constitutional right to associate does not allow for a guarantee to bargain collectively, nor does it ensure the fundamental right to withdraw services from an employer who is determined not to bargain in good faith. Working Canadians need constitutional law that ensures that our workplaces are not turned into regressive labour nightmares dreamed up by those who would perpetuate the myth that right to work legislation is any kind of an alternative for working people.

Workers' rights to bargain collectively and the right to withhold service must be entrenched in the Constitution if the right to associate holds any meaning at all.

Economics of Living: A truly Canadian Constitution must recognize the basic right to economic security for all Canadians. A mixed economy that shares our vast wealth fairly amongst all people can be a reality. We as a nation should put that truism in writing in our Constitution. What manner of amending formula should guide any future changes to our Constitution? Certainly not an unworkable one that requires unanimity and completely stalls the amending process. Seven provinces representing 50 percent or more of our population should be more than enough requirement to follow through with an amending process.

In conclusion, the Dauphin and District Labour Co-ordinating Committee, its members and families thank this legislative task force for allowing us time to share our hopes and our vision of the kind of Canada we all dream about. Your task force has been charged with an undertaking that is historical in its implications. We hope that we have been able to assist you in getting it right. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, sir. Questions from the task force.

Mr. Praznik: Yes, I am just looking for some clarification with respect to your representation by population in the House of Commons. Representation by population—in essence, one person, one vote or some equivalency—has always been held to be a fundamental principle of democracy. I would like you to clarify your recommending that we alter the election of our House of Commons to some other form. I am asking for some guidance and clarification as to what you are suggesting, sir.

Mr. Lapointe: Well, Mr. Praznik, it is well known by everybody in this room and, certainly, everybody across western Canada, that representation by population does not serve western Canadians very fairly. The fact is that historically the province of Prince Edward Island has been guaranteed—with the small number of occupants it has—four federal seats in the federal House. There are no such guarantees in western Canada. I suggest to you that if that is the kind of representation by population that has been historically the founding part of Canada or the thing that held Canada together, it has not worked very well. I suggest that we have something different.

Now people are talking about an elected Senate. We say no elected Senate. We say regional representation. We say that western Canada should have as much clout in the House of Commons as any other area of Canada. It just is not so. We are just plain tired of taking it, and taking it, and taking it, and we want some change.

Mr. Praznik: So I can gather then what you are suggesting is that the House of Commons abandon the principle. By the way, the guarantee for Prince Edward Island is based on minimum number of Senate seats and applies equally across the country to all provinces. Manitoba could not fall below six. I appreciate what you are saying, but it is a guarantee that applies everywhere.

What you are suggesting then is that each province or each region of the country have the same number of Members in the House of Commons and that we do not have any type of reform Senate to reflect those regional representations. Is that correct? Would that be your position?

* (1920)

Mr. Lapointe: You understand me clearly to the point that I do not accept that we should have an elected Senate. I do not accept, our organization does not accept, that we have a Senate of any kind. We feel that it is just another level of Government that does not pay attention to what Canadians want. We have seen this circus going on for some months in the Senate. We have seen the political appointments going on from on high and some of them rather shady, I might add. We are not happy with that kind of thing in western Canada. We do not see it ever working to our advantage. Certainly, we are talking about advantage here, because we have been disadvantaged for long enough.

Mr. Chairman: Any other questions?

Mrs. Render: Yes, Mr. Lapointe, if we do away with

the House of Commons and the Senate in the forms that we are used to them, how do you suggest then that we get regional representations so that our regional concerns are addressed?

Mr. Lapointe: That would have to be an absolute thorough consultation with all regions of the country, all the provinces. I would like to point out that one thing that I did not address in my brief to this task force tonight is that I think it also has to include the territories, the Northwest Territories and the Yukon. I think that is a failure. That has been a failure in the past, and it is a failure in the future, that if all Canadians do not have some part to play in developing what the future House of Commons looks like and what it is designed like, then it will not fairly represent all Canadians.

I think all Canadians right across the country have an important part to play in that. I think they have got something to say, and I think this task force is one venue for us to be able to vent our frustrations and make suggestions to you. I do not have any designed plan here with me tonight. I would think that would take some time for all the power brokers, all the people that follow the power brokers in this country, to sit in the rooms, in the auditoriums across Canada, and make those decisions en masse.

I do not think they should be made from the top down. I think Canadians of all walks of life should be part and parcel of changing that design, but it certainly needs changing. I mean, it just does not make any sense, just for historical sense, to keep the House of Commons the way it is because we are not fairly represented in western Canada, and that is the bottom line.

Mrs. Render: Okay, I certainly hear your frustrations, but I have not heard your suggestions that we, as an all-Party task force, can take to such a meeting. You talked about not starting at the top and working down but starting at the grass roots level, and this is why we are here today, or tonight rather. Could you perhaps maybe elaborate on your suggestion as to how we are going to—even such a thing as the method of selecting people to serve in the Government?

Mr. Lapointe: I believe first that you are going to have to start with all the provincial Legislatures, and you are going to have to start with the Legislatures in the territories. You are going to have to have them address that.

I have told you that I do not have any master plan. I think that a master plan can be developed that will work better. I believe that all Canadians should have a part in that plan, and I think that is where you get started. As somebody said to me before I came here tonight, you know, Lou, it is wonderful what you are saying here, but you know what, you are going to say it to this task force and you know what, it is too simple for them. It is just too damn simple. They are not going to listen. They are not going to pay attention because they do not think that average ordinary Canadians know what they want. They do not believe that western Canadians and working Canadians know how to develop their futures.

Well, they are wrong. We do know, but we need the co-operation of the power brokers. If we do not get the co-operation of the power brokers we are not going anywhere with it, so we need all the present levels of Government to be working in concert with us, not leaving us out in the dark, not having us working in back rooms developing briefs to task forces that are not going to be adhered to or not going to be used in any policy that would be set in the future. We want that kind of participation, and I think that is what we can offer. We cannot offer you any fine design this evening. I think that is going to take a long time, that is going to take several years to develop, but I believe it is possible if we work together.

Ms. Friesen: I think you have told us very clearly some of the things that you value about Canada: strong central Government, multicultural people, many languages, diversity, medical care system. I wonder if your organization had the opportunity to talk as well, though, about the position of Quebec and how the kinds of things which you value might also find a place in Quebec values.

Mr. Lapointe: I was fortunate last spring to be down in Montreal at the Canadian Labour Congress biannual convention, and we were able to address some of those issues on convention floor. You must understand that Louis Laberge and the Quebec Federation of Labour do not necessarily fall in line with the federations of labour or those affiliates with the Canadian Labour Congress in other parts of the country. Even within our own labour organizations we have great debates going on about how this country should change and what the future of the country should be.

Obviously, those of us who have been raised in western Canada see things a lot differently than our brothers and sisters in eastern Canada. We are willing to sit down, discuss and debate the issues with

them, and I am glad that you brought it up because it is very important with the release in Quebec of the governing Party's statement on what they see for the future of Quebec in Canada just the other day. It is very important that we discuss those issues with them. I think we have to sit down and discuss them with them. I mean, I think it is a responsibility for us as western Canadians to try and understand what people in the other end of the country live like and why they think differently than us, and why they live differently than we do. They do live differently than we do, and that is a fact of life. We are just going to have to be able to sit down and talk it out.

Mr. Carr: Sir, you talk about western Canada and western Canadians. What does that mean? Are you saying that the political culture and the political dynamics of Manitoba are the same as Alberta, the same as British Columbia, the same as Saskatchewan? Maybe you can help us out a little bit and just define for us what you mean by the western Canadian interest. What are those values that we as Westerners share that we ought to take to a constitutional table?

Mr. Lapointe: I believe that as western Canadians we are not thinking in terms of political allegiance. I think we are talking in terms of a feel for the land, a feel for people, a feel for what is going on in our country.

I think that sets us apart from central Canada where you have the highly concentrated population. I think it is much like the scientific models that you see from time to time of rats, little, white laboratory rats, running around in a maze. I would suspect, if you were to do a similar task force right now in one of the major cities in Ontario, that you may not have as many people out to listen to you or to make presentations to you, except the very, very interested special interest groups which would, of course, be talking about it.

I am not talking about the political make-up of western Canada. I am talking about the people who have been raised here and reared here and identify with the land and identify with the social issues that we deal with on a day-to-day basis. They are different than central Canada's issues; they are different than Quebec's issues. We are small in population, and so we have to fight harder for everything that we get.

It has always been the case in this country, and maybe elsewhere in the world, that the squeaky wheel gets the grease. Well, we are not squeaking loud enough, and there are not enough wheels out in western Canada to make a difference. So the whole political make-up, the whole structure of the politics of western Canada, of our nation, has to change in order to make it fairer for western Canadians. That is what I am talking about. I am talking about people belonging here and feeling that this is our land, this is our country, this is where we belong, this is where we were raised, and this is what we want to see happen. But we have to do it together.

Mr. Chairman: Any other questions? I just have one for you, sir. You make reference to the failure of the Constitution to provide guarantees with regard to collective bargaining. I wonder if I take you right when I say that suggests that there has been a failure of the Charter to protect and that that failure needs to be remedied in terms of some areas of collective rights. Is that what I should read in that statement?

Mr. Lapointe: That is exactly what you should read in that statement. I believe that the labour leaders and the political leaders that joined in the 1919 Winnipeg General Strike, if they were here to be able to talk to us today, would be absolutely shocked that things have gone so far backwards from that point in history when they were making history-making decisions, and they were fighting for history-making rights for workers in Canada. I think things have taken a turn for the worse in the last 15, 20 years, and I believe that there has to be some entrenchment in the Constitution on workers' rights.

One of those guarantees has to be the right to collective bargaining and the right to withhold service. Many times the federal Government has stepped in and ordered workers back to work, and that creates a problem for workers. I am not saying that every worker in the country should be able to go out on strike. I will be quite frank with you; I think strike is the last thing in the world that anybody would want to do or anybody would want to promote. But it should, at least, at the very least, be a right, and it should be entrenched in the Constitution as a right. I mean, we are not talking about slave trade anymore; we are talking about a free, open, economic society that can develop these kinds of laws and deal with them appropriately.

Now, from time to time, Governments change and legislation changes. So what happens? Then on a provincial level or even a local level there are no protections for workers; they lose all of their rights. That is not correct. I mean, it just is not fair.

* (1930)

Mr. Praznik: I am interested in your comments with

respect to entrenchment of the right to bargain collectively and the right to strike, and I am interested in your comments with respect to something like first contract legislation which takes away that right. I say that because when you put a right in the Constitution, the right to strike, you have that right. Yet various labour legislation in the country—first contract, for example, that is in place in many provinces—removes that right because while you go to first contract you do not have the right to strike. Final offer selection, which the Manitoba Federation of Labour supported, took away that right by having the option of going to a selector. So, if you have the right to strike, then Government legislation would not be there to impede it. I am not quite sure how you handle that dilemma.

Mr. Lapointe: It is a dilemma for working people, but as I said before, that strike would be the last resort that any woman or person on the work floor would want to have to take. I would have to point out to you, I suppose, or I should not have to point out to you, that final offer selection was a choice. It was another option to avoid strike, but that does not mean that very basic right to withdraw a service should not be entrenched. If the provincial Legislatures, the labour unions and the labour movement across the country wish to sit down together and develop provincial legislation that will give them an option outside of that, then that is wonderful.

That is wonderful, and I think that is what the Manitoba Federation of Labour was getting at. I think that is what organized labour, in the majority of organized labour in the province of Manitoba, was talking about when they defended final offer selection. It gave a choice, and yes, some people would say, well, that is a dilemma. Certainly it is a dilemma, but it is a choice, and I think that is what we deserve as Canadians—to have an option. When there is no option, then we are in serious trouble. That is what is happening in the Gulf War crisis. All of a sudden everyone that is in the coalition closed down the options.

Mr. Praznik: Now, Mr. Chair, I just make this comment that when you enshrine something as a right in the Constitution, provincial Legislatures then do not have the ability to provide options around that right. Either one has it or one does not. I just ask you—I have heard your comments on it—just to appreciate the dilemma that in fact creates.

Mr. Lapointe: The dilemma that you are trying to point out is a fictional one. What I am trying to say is that working people would have an option, that they would not necessarily have to strike because you enshrine in a federal Constitution the right to strike. It does not necessarily mean that we would have to strike. Final offer selection would not knock away at the foundations of that; it would give us another option. Maybe final offer selection is not the right thing to be talking about. Maybe it is something else, but I think the provincial Legislatures and trade unions should be able to sit down and work that kind of legislation out provincially.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lapointe, thank you very much, sir.

Mr. Lapointe: Thank you for hearing us.

Mr. Chairman: Our next presenter, Mr. Alex Simpson. Good evening, sir.

Mr. Alex Simpson (Private Citizen): Good evening. I might say that I wish to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and the other Members of this task force panel for giving me the opportunity to say a few words about my thoughts on what I hope Canada will be in the future.

I had prepared a few topics that I wish to discuss this evening, and I think they fall into three main categories. Some of them have been already handled extremely well, one of them being bilingualism. I am not going to dwell on that to any extent because I think that was handled very well by Dr. Ritchie and Mr. Halliburton.

I am here this evening as an individual not representing any particular group, although I am a veteran of five and a half years in World War II. I think we earned the right to have something to do with the future of Canada.

I am diametrically opposed to bilingualism and all it entails, cost and the other ramifications of that very concept. It is not only the cost, but in our schools—and we are having it in Manitoba right now—we are finding that we have not got the money to do the things we want to do. It seems to me we are trying to be all things to all people. I think it would be far more to the point—and I have nothing against several languages. My father and mother spoke and wrote and read three languages, but I think it would be more to the point if we cut out some of the frills in our school system by providing a half dozen languages or more, and maybe teach some of our Canadians and would-be Canadians what Canadianism is all about.

I might add one more point on that. We have seen the utter waste in this province, not because of the

province's doing, but because of the federal court having us rewrite statutes which gathered dust for many, many decades, just for the sake of having them rewritten to please a small minority of people in this province. I think that money could have been directed probably to education, to health care and many other aspects of our society.

The high cost of packaging of foods, advertisements and everything of this nature is multiplied to a ridiculous point by all this duplication.

Another item that I am diametrically opposed to, and I have been criticized for this—it may not be very popular in this community—but I am going to say it anyway. This business of multiculturalism and all these grants that are handed out hither, thither and yon, to me—and I said it before when Mr. Eugene Kostyra was the Minister in charge of that very thing. I have said it on two occasions on a public platform that the monies that are dribbled away into these various multicultural things could be better spent towards health care and possibly some of that money directed towards providing some of the glue that would make us better Canadians.

* (1940)

The other item that I will deal with briefly, and it has also been handled very well by two previous speakers, is the matter of immigration. I think our immigration policy, to put it mildly, smells. I do not think we have an immigration policy. I am not against immigration. I think we have to have it, but I do not think it is too selective.

On top of that, we have seen the Iron Curtain come down in Europe. There are many thousands of young German people, family people, skilled people, who could come to this country and meld very well into our society as they have done before. Maybe in some quarters that may not sound very popular, coming from a fellow with five and a half years during the Second World War, but it is a fact nevertheless, and I think we had better start thinking about some of these things.

We are bringing people over here who when we get them here we have to start teaching them the language of the country. I think this is a big mistake. Yes, it does provide some jobs, but I think it is a drastic mistake, the type of immigration we are getting.

I think with that I will conclude. If you wish to ask me any questions, I will be glad to answer them.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, sir. Any questions?

Ms. Friesen: I think I understand the things that you are opposed to—bilingualism, multiculturalism—but I am not getting a very clear idea of what you mean when you say what Canada is all about, the glue that holds us together. I wonder, could you give me some advice on that, the kinds of ideals that you hold for Canada in a positive sense?

Mr. Simpson: Yes. I think our institutions that we gained at tremendous cost in sacrifice in two world wars are being gradually eroded, and newcomers coming to our shores are being granted all the rights and privileges that it took us a lifetime to gain. This, to me, is wrong.

Ms. Friesen: When you say institutions, which are the ones that you value? Which are the ones that you want to protect?

Mr. Simpson: I want to protect for one thing, I suppose you would call them an institutions, our federal police force. I think that has taken a bad battering. I think it is ridiculous when we have had an excellent police force in this country, for the most part, highly regarded throughout the world, and then we allow what was never in it before, religion, to creep into that force. It is wrong, wrong, wrong.

Ms. Friesen: Are there other things besides the Mounted Police which would hold Canada together?

Mr. Simpson: Just offhand I do not think I can particularly name any one thing, but I feel that probably our railways originally cemented this country together, and they have been decimated at the whims of a few. Every other industrialized country of the world is developing the railways, and we are throwing them out. There are two of the things.

Mr. Chairman: Any other questions? Thanks again, Mr. Simpson.

Mr. Simpson: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Walter Kolisnyk. Wesley Saari. How are you, sir?

Mr. Wesley Saari (Private Citizen): Oh, not too bad.

Mr. Chairman: Good. We have your written presentation. Just proceed when you are ready. Thanks.

Mr. Saari: My name is Wesley Saari and I have been living in the North for the past 20 years, and I am writing in regard to the problems facing Canadians today in the past 20 years.

I have worked in various occupations, such as mining, farming, ranching, construction, zookeeper, baker, fisherman, labourer, in different areas of the

North and the problem starts right from the top. Federal, provincial Governments have lost control of this country, and it is in the hands of the Americans and—I should word it differently— people from the outside. Because I know if you mention the word "foreigners," it is a slang word. Big corporations and private sector businesses are American owned, such as Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting, Inco, pulp and paper mills, et cetera. Why is this?

The simple fact is that 2 million Canadians are unemployed and foreigners are taking over our jobs. Canadians are not being trained as promised. Why is this? The fact is the Government is not particularly concerned with the poor as long as the wealthiest maintain their status quo. Does the Government not realize that the generation of funds by all people go hand in hand with the performance of our economy. With 2 million people unemployed, where and how are these people going to invest in our economy and buy goods, such as cars, homes, et cetera, without a steady job?

Why does the Government discriminate against the poor? If the Government would start training us Canadians and put us to work, at least half the 2 million people would be back to work and the economy would perhaps grow somewhat stronger. This can be done by Government getting involved with big corporations to the extent that they either hire and train Canadians, or they begin to pay their taxes—no handout without commitment. This could be the reason for the $10.5 billion insurance deficit. Half of this could be cut by the employment ministers getting out into the areas of corporate control and putting forth strict laws, such as major corporations are required by law not to hire people outside of Canada unless Canadians come first to be trained and put into apprenticeship programs to become skilled in all occupations such as mining, plumbing, mechanics, machinists and skilled labour. Unless they obey this law, Government would then have to raise their taxes and fine them certain amounts such as $50,000, for example.

The Minister of Labour of each province would ensure that the law stated above is obeyed and make each large corporation submit, on a yearly basis, the names of each employee hired and trained. Do not forget this is taxpayers' money being used out of proportion.

The hiring of people through union halls should be abolished. They are also the main reason why so many people from the outside in our country are coming in, and they do not train us to become skilled tradespeople. I would like to know why some big corporations do not pay tax and are not required to pay taxes and, secondly, why they discriminate against Canadians. I would like to know why $27 billion in lost taxes was not collected from 1979 to 1989, as statistics show in the Free Press, directly from Ottawa.

* (1950)

Why is the Government trying to hold the poor responsible for the deficit such as a 7 percent sales tax to be imposed while the big rich corporations do not pay taxes and get huge tax breaks? Why is it that such Governments give the corporations handouts without any commitment when they go into bankruptcy? The 10 Ministers of Employment and Immigration should get a list of people who want to become skilled tradespeople and labourers, have it on hand to show the big corporations that these are the first priority before hiring anybody else.

The reasons I am writing this are because I am one of those people who our Government does not care about. I have been trying to get my trade for the last 24 years, and I signed apprenticeships with the Government for Limestone and never even got a labourer's job while being a resident of the North for 18 years. My pride and love of the North is destroyed, and I am being replaced by people from outside the country. Even the richest province in Canada, Alberta, is to blame for the unemployment insurance deficit as they are not being trained also. All they want are skilled journeymen tradesmen. If you do not have a ticket, you are a welfare case, but what is the purpose of the apprenticeship program when Governments are ignoring us Canadians?

We do not need capitalism here. What about major contractors in construction and union halls who do not hire unless you are a journeyman? What about Government themselves not training their own people. If you cannot find experienced people such as air traffic controllers, managers, et cetera, they go to the States or go abroad. Just like bringing in foreign hockey players, while we do not have experienced coaches to train our kids to become skilled hockey players.

What about major oil and gas companies who are given handouts when they are about to go into bankruptcy without any commitment from Government to train our Canadians? Training and hiring should be a strict prerequisite to handouts from

Government to corporations. We are supposed to live in a democratic society "for the people, by the people," and yet the Government cares not for the poverty stricken.

We need someone in Parliament who has been around and has worked their butt off to survive, someone who knows that we cannot survive without a united Canada. We must train in all areas of different classifications, Canadians to become skilled in all aspects of life. All people must be treated equally and the levels of life adjusted to make people in poverty equal to what would constitute an average Canadian citizen.

Discrimination is really a concern in this country and must be dealt with in order to make men and women work and live together in a peaceful manner. We need a reformed Government that cares for those in poverty and to create uniform standards. People on welfare, the Government treats like a bunch of dogs, stay there because we will not train you for skilled labour jobs. Natives living in tents in isolated areas of Canada should not be on welfare because we have skilled people from overseas to do their jobs.

People living in the North have all their lives been deprived of their rights by Government who will not train Natives and other minorities but will put them on welfare first. Instead, when dams are built, such as Limestone, Natives and people living in the North lose their rights, such as jobs, money, livelihood, recreation, but most importantly their freedom. This means people who have devoted most of their lives to working and living in the North are deprived of their freedom when they must move south when their jobs are jeopardized by foreigners, and I am one of those.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, sir. Are there any questions? Thanks again. Debbie Sorochynski.

Mrs. Debby Sorochynski (Private Citizen): Is this for short people?

Mr. Chairman: Good evening.

Mrs. Sorochynski: Good evening. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, bitaemol My name is Debby Sorochynski and I am a resident of Manitoba. I was born, raised and educated in Winnipeg. I have lived in Rossburn, and for the last 15 years I have resided in Dauphin. My husband and I have two children who attend the Ukrainian bilingual program in Dauphin. I freelance in the Parkland Region in marketing, advertising and promotion as well as being a registered volunteer trainer with the Department of Culture, Heritage and Recreation. I am also an active community volunteer.

I believe that many of our most serious problems as a country can be traced to the apathy and non-involvement of Canadians in public affairs and to decisions that too frequently ignore the popular will. Governments today assume far too large a role in our lives for us to allow decisions to be made solely by bureaucrats, pressure groups and political professionals. For this reason, I am grateful for the opportunity to be involved in this hearing.

I have always viewed my Canadian citizenship as more than simply the geographic location of my residence. To me, Canada is more than 10 provinces linked together with common boundaries. It is a union of our people, and as the people of Canada, I believe that we should all be treated equally, treated equally in federal law and our Constitution without regard to race, language and culture rather than being treated specially in federal law and our Constitution because of our race, language and culture.

As a province of Canada, we should support a policy of equal partnership. I believe Manitoba should support the position that Confederation be maintained only by a clear commitment to a Canada as one nation in which the demands and aspirations of all regions are entitled to equal status, and constitutional negotiations and political debate, and in which freedom of expression is fully accepted as the basis for language policy across our country.

Equality of all Canadians does not mean that racial, linguistic or cultural distinctions are not important and should not be preserved. It does not mean abandoning the Canadian mosaic and jumping into the American melting pot.

Preserving linguistic and cultural distinctions where necessary should be assigned to individuals, groups and lower levels of Government. The Government of Canada should be responsible to provide equality of opportunity for all Canadians.

I believe that Canada's emphasis on multiculturalism is a political smoke screen and only appears to equalize opportunity. Many people who generally oppose discrimination think that the only way to create real equality in Canadian society is to require a certain amount of discrimination in favour of the groups that formerly had been shut out of opportunities.

For example, federal transfer payments to our school division include up to as much as $1,500 per classroom for language aids. These monies are only available to French immersion classrooms. The

Secretary of State also provides funds for these French teachers to apply to travel to Quebec and even France for language training. None of these monies are available to other language programs.

* (2000)

In the 1989-90 school year, Manitoba residents supported three bilingual heritage language programs: Hebrew, Ukrainian and German. Core heritage language programs were supported in Hebrew, Ukrainian, German, Chinese, Icelandic, Latin, Portuguese, Filipino and Spanish.

Discrimination in favour of one ethnic group means cutting other groups out of some important advantages. I believe that any time discrimination is used as an equalizer the overall results are negative.

The current Canadian concept of multiculturalism is badly flawed. I strongly believe that the preservation of cultural background should be a matter of personal choice. Whether or not an ethnic group preserves its cultural background is the group's choice. Why should someone 2,000 miles away tell us what is important to us to preserve?

Now grantsmanship is becoming a national preoccupation of our volunteer sector. I have witnessed groups scrambling to put together a scenario on paper so they can pick up some free federal dollars simply because they are there, and if they do not claim them another group will, or because a Government agent is pushing to give out our area's quota.

Certainly there are times when assistance is needed. Over the past few years, our Manitoba Government has exhibited a helping hand rather than a hand-out approach to grants. Groups and organizations first show a real need and demonstrate willingness to work to achieve their goal before our Government joins in partnership.

Having assistance decided by a level of Government closest to the situation increases the odds of getting it done right, on a needs basis. Transfer payments to provinces should include funds for these endeavours and should come to the provinces "no strings attached."

Manitoba, like the rest of Canada, is facing an economic crisis. I would like to see Manitoba fight for "no strings attached" transfer payments to provinces. Provincial priority spending should be decided by the provinces, not the federal Government.

The purpose of this task force is to assist the Government of Manitoba in establishing a positive agenda for constitutional change. Having public hearings is a good opportunity to express our views and concerns with regard to Canada's future and Manitoba's place in that future. However, I believe it clearly reflects a Pollyanna-like assumption that all people who head Governments are people of good will and that the federal and provincial Governments will find a way to agree on the basic future direction of Canada.

My preference would, therefore, be to see a series of constitutional conventions across the country at which delegates directly elected by our Canadian people would debate and vote upon proposals for constitutional change. Such conventions should be assisted by technical committees to prepare draft proposals and should receive input from various interest groups.

The output of such conventions should go to the Legislatures, a First Ministers' Conference and to Parliament for further review and implementation only after ratification by the electorate. By ratification, I mean a simple majority vote of the electorate of Canada, including approval by a simple majority in at least two-thirds of the provinces, including the territories. Electors could vote directly on the legal text of such amendments concurrent with federal general elections.

My preference is for a bottom-up, people-directed approach to constitution making as opposed to a top-down, elitist approach to constitution making. I also believe that our aboriginal leaders should be invited to conduct their own constitutional convention to spell out for all to see their vision of Canada and their place in it.

I believe that such a convention would produce concrete proposals for doing away with the Department of Indian Affairs and transferring the majority of its functions and responsibilities to aboriginal agencies and Governments. I also believe that such a convention could go a long way toward answering such questions as to how to hold aboriginal agencies and Governments accountable to their own people and to society at large for their own actions and for the welfare of aboriginal peoples.

A negotiation of such arrangements should assign both the responsibility and the resources for aboriginal development to aboriginal peoples themselves, while assigning to our federal Government the responsibility for establishing

equality of opportunity for all Canadians without regard to race, language and culture.

Canada is no longer a meeting place of two founding races, cultures and languages. The reality of Manitoba reflects the country. We are comprised of many cultural groups, all with different traditions and languages. The vast majority are unilingual.

I believe that through a referendum we would create a language policy that reflects both the aspirations of Manitobans and the demographic reality of our country; that is, recognition of French in Quebec and English elsewhere as the predominant languages of work and society. In other words, Quebec should be delegated the legal and financial responsibility for preserving the French fact within Quebec, while the federal Government, the Government of Canada, should pursue the equality in law of all Canadians.

Manitoba should continue to lead the way in supporting minority education where numbers warrant. Enforced bilingualism should be removed from the provincial level and any forced language policy from private sector institutions and personal lives. Official bilingualism is reasonable only in key federal institutions such as Parliament and the Supreme Court and critical federal services, where numbers warrant.

In summation, I would like to state that I strongly believe that every individual group and province and region in Canada is entitled to fundamental justice and that fundamental justice entitles the people of each region to benefit equally without discrimination from participation in Confederation and from the programs and expenditures of the Government of Canada. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you very much, Mrs. Sorochynski. Any questions? Mr. Lathlin, then Ms. Friesen.

Mr. Lathlin: Mr. Chair, I do not have a question. I was looking at Ms. Friesen.

Mr. Chairman: Exchanging glances at opposite ends of the table. I am sorry. I misinterpreted the signal.

Ms. Friesen: I am afraid I did too. I just wanted to ask about your endorsing official bilingualism in key federal institutions. Some of them, such as Parliament, the Supreme Court and federal services, could include quite a large number of people. I wonder how you would see Manitobans having access to those institutions. How do we ensure that Manitobans become part of that bilingual work force?

Mrs. Sorochynski: I am not sure I understand the question. My feeling is that if there are enough people in an area in a community that require a service, the people providing the service had better be able to speak their language. If the people are French, then the people providing the service should be able to speak French.

Ms. Friesen: So the people who provide the service would be unilingual in either English or French?

Mrs. Sorochynski: Where the marketplace demanded.

Ms. Friesen: You are not particularly endorsing the idea of a bilingual public service?

Mrs. Sorochynski: No. I am saying that if there are enough—example, Dauphin General Hospital, our signage is in English and Ukrainian. There is a reason for that, and I believe that any policy that is driven by the needs of the marketplace should reflect that. Does that answer your question?

Ms. Friesen: Yes. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Any other questions? If I may just follow up on what Ms. Friesen asked you, Mrs. Sorochynski, I take it that your approach to language is purely one of utility. If language is needed to serve the people, then that language should be provided, whether it be English, French, Ukrainian or whether it be one of the aboriginal languages, whatever. Is that the fundamental principle on which you are operating?

Mrs. Sorochynski: That is a good question. I was thinking in relationship to bilingualism as English and French in the public sector, but if I lived in a Portuguese community I would assume that if, as an English-speaking person, I went into the marketplace, if everybody spoke Portuguese I would be unhappy in that environment. I would go to an English-speaking environment to spend my money. Then I guess a direct answer to your question would be yes, a case of utility in the marketplace.

Mr. Chairman: Well, you gave the example of the Dauphin Hospital, where the signage is English and Ukrainian, and surely that is a reflection of the need to provide signage in those two languages.

Mrs. Sorochynski: Then I answer yes.

Mr. Chairman: But not to provide it in other languages, based on the utility of the citizens of Dauphin.

Mrs. Sorochynski: I do not believe in an enforced language policy. I think it has to be dependent on what the marketplace needs are.

* (2010)

Mr. Chairman: It is interesting. In a sense what you are reflecting is the Swiss federal system solution to language, just as a matter of interest. Different federal systems provide different solutions where there is more than one language, and in the case of Switzerland the decisions about language and the use thereof is driven down to the provincial Governments and to local Governments. The federal Government itself really does not provide policy on language, although it will provide service in the official languages in Switzerland.

Mrs. Sorochynski: And it worked successfully there?

Mr. Chairman: Well, it works for the Swiss, but of course the Swiss are not Canadians and one has to be leary about translations.

Mrs. Sorochynski: We have Swiss-Canadians.

Mr. Chairman: Thanks very, very much. The next presentation is from the Parkland Status of Women, and I believe Ms. Rae Tigg will be making the presentation.

Ms. Rae Tigg (Parkland Status of Women): Good evening.

Mr. Chairman: Good evening to you.

Ms. Tigg: I appreciate the opportunity to speak with you today on our concerns about the constitutional reform. Before I begin, I would like to briefly introduce our organization to you. The Parkland Status of Women, a branch of the Manitoba Action Committee on the Status of Women, is a volunteer, non-profit, non-partisan, provincial organization with a mandate to improve attitudes, raise issues and remove inequalities affecting women today.

Through political action and public education Parkland Status of Women works to alleviate inequalities in the areas of economic, social and legal rights. I am here on behalf of women throughout the Parkland area. When the task force on the Meech Lake Constitutional Accord was in Dauphin on April 26, 1989, our organization presented a brief. I am here again today to present a brief and our group will again present a brief to the Spicer Commission and any other task force that the Government deems necessary.

As was stated in the report produced by the Manitoba Task Force on the Meech Lake Accord: "Individuals and women's organizations were almost unanimous in their remedy to these problems. Over and over presenters told the task force Members that they should either recommend Clause 16 be deleted or the accord be amended to guarantee that nothing in it shall be interpreted to abrogate or derogate from the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and specifically Sections 15 and 28. The sex equality rights in these sections that women won in 1982 should be given the same protection as aboriginal and multicultural rights."

Further to this, the task force recommended: "The entire Charter of Rights and Freedoms should be included to provide equal protection to those rights and freedoms enjoyed by Canadians. This solution responds directly to the fears and worries expressed by the greatest number of presenters in Manitoba. It is the solution that Manitobans requested. The task force believes that when considering an issue as important as the basic rights and freedoms enjoyed by all Canadians, it is better to err on the side of too much protection. The wishes of Canadians as expressed by Manitobans during the hearings should be respected."

The Parkland Status of Women wishes to endorse these recommendations made by the Manitoba Task Force on the Meech Lake Accord. Finally, as a representative of the Parkland Status of Women, I would like to state that the Charter should stand as a binding national document protecting the rights of all Canadian women and no province should have the option to opt out of the agreement. Canadian women have earned the right to be treated as equal partners in Canadian society, and these rights should never be put in jeopardy.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you very much. Any questions? Thanks again, Ms. Tigg. The next presenter, Jim Donald. How are you, sir?

Mr. Jim Donald (Private Citizen): Fine, thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Welcome.

Mr. Donald: Thanks. I am not nearly as well prepared as all your other presenters. These are just a few thoughts that I put down when I had the right idea of phoning and getting myself lined up for this presentation, so it is not very coherent or perhaps too logically strung together, but you will have to bear with me on this.

Just a couple of observations about Canada, and change in particular. I do not think it is odd that we should have change in our Constitution or in the structure of our country. I think if we did not have any change, it would be mighty strange and we should be

worried.

A few other things: Sometimes I think recently we have been too confused about the history of Canada. The history of Canada—there is a lot more to it than our post-World War II history, and our pre-World War II history has a big bearing on how this country came to be and what it means. A lot of the changes that we are always discussing are changes brought out post-World War II, when we were flushed with lots of awesome optimism and lots of cash. I think we have probably been living beyond our means in a lot of respects, because the cash has obviously run out. It is easy to be generous when your bank account is full. I think our future Constitution should protect us from this sort of thing, and at least caution Governments that they have a responsibility to be fiscally responsible.

As a response to Quebec, well, I do not know. I think the death of Meech Lake was a good thing. I think it was the last of a long series of, essentially, bribes to keep Quebec as part of this country, and I do not think too many people know why we really want them as part of the country. Is it just the geography? Do we like to see Canada stretched from coast to coast? What does Quebec give to us a lot of times? We seem to be bending over backwards a lot of times to satisfy Quebec's "demands," and it seems to me that the death of Meech was a good thing because the demands would never end.

If Quebec wants something that we cannot even understand to respond to in a manner that they will comprehend, I say if they really want to go, let them go. Let us not have a big debate to try to keep them here. You cannot keep the people in a country except by force of arms anyway if they want to go. You could offer them more money, I suppose, more power, but it all boils down to the death of a thousand cuts or get it over with. That is all I have to say about Quebec, I guess.

* (2020)

As far as decentralization of power to the provinces, I do not really understand all of the issues there. I think we need a fairly strong central Government, because I think, by definition, the provincial leaders—and I mean no disrespect of our provincial—that is their job, and to ask them to look after their neighbour, too, is asking them to wear two hats most of the time. So I think you cannot devolve too much power to the provinces without having the country slowly melt away or disintegrate. Which powers and stuff, I am not at all certain. Maybe there are some you can give to the provinces with no trouble, but just as a central theme, I think we should keep a strong central Government.

I think we should abolish the Senate. I do not think it serves any useful purpose whatsoever. It does not provide any "check or balance." It might be a useful research tool, but you could do that cheaper by hiring consultants.

I do not really know how you get a regional balance in a Government. I think if the main-line Parties had a lot less strict Party discipline, and if they listened to their backbenchers and gave their backbenchers freedom to dissent, you would automatically get some regional balance. I think it takes a little more guts on the part of the people who run for office. I do not see anything really essentially wrong with the way we elect people. I just do not think they perform all that well when they get there because of the strict Party discipline. The other thing, if they do not loosen the ties on their Members, we will just simply get more Parties, more regional Parties, which I do not think is necessarily a bad thing. Coalition Governments often work all right.

I think there should be some property rights in our Constitution, too. That is one of the reasons people came to this country is they wanted their own property. They did not want somebody taking it away and giving it to somebody else for whatever reason. I can see some expropriation laws, but in the case of the City of Winnipeg where The Forks development—some fellow did not want to sell at the price he was offered. They expropriated and gave it to the other guy. There is no real rationale for that, so I think we need some property rights.

The notwithstanding clause, I think, is a big joke. It leaves too big an out. If the Constitution is supposed to be a set of guidelines and rules, you cannot just quit playing when you feel like it. Something has to be done there, I would think.

There is another point here. I call it pressure-group rights. I feel if there is somewhere in the Constitution that says "all people of Canada," I think that is sufficient; I think that is all-encompassing; I do not think we have to define anything else other than that. It does lead to all sorts of side debates about the rights of this group, the rights of that group, and I do not think any group has more rights than another. It is like saying some are created more equal than others. We have seen where that gets us in certain countries of the world. I think it is a bad way of looking at things.

I think this applies to our Indian population, too. I am not my brother's keeper. I am not responsible for the sins of my father. How far back in history do we have to go? Do I have to apologize for something that I did not do, had no part in? I would say the here and now is a lot more important. I think Indian reservations are ghettos; I think they do a disservice to the Indians. Whatever the rights or the wrongs of history, I do not think you can correct them or whatever by enshrining future rights. All you enshrine is future resentment from the people who do not have those rights. You cannot turn the clock back. Nothing stays the same forever. Nothing is in perpetuity.

Once we had the Crow rate here, a different issue; it was in perpetuity, enshrined in legislation. It is not here now because it did not fit. It was by common agreement something that was past its time, and I think that is what happens if you try to enshrine permanent separate rights for either groups or individuals.

I am afraid my same sentiments with this multicultural debate, as you have probably gathered, it is just more of the same. I think the way it occurred is an offshoot of the bilingualism bribe we offered Quebec. You know it all of a sudden became obvious that one bribe was not enough, you had to start buying off everybody else too. I think it is a total failure. It divides people; it does not bring them together.

The Amending Formula: I think some type of majority, which specific type I am not too sure, but some measure of two-thirds; like an unanimous solution is just totally unworkable. Nobody agrees on anything in this room, I will wager, especially something as complex as this. It is just pie in the sky, you know.

Just another little thing here: I have trouble with a lot of Canadians who define their identity by how anti-American they are. I really get tired of that. Start defining ourselves in how we look at the world instead of how we are against what our giant neighbour to the south does all the time. I just find there is too much reaction against that. They do have good ideas, you know, in a lot of instances. I also have problems with that, and I am not exactly sure if this phrase is in the Constitution: peace, order and good Government. Like nothing there is defined; it is hardly inspiring. I think we could find something better there.

That is it. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Donald. Any questions? Thanks again. The next presenter is Dan Jamieson. How are you, sir?

Mr. Dan Jamieson (Private Citizen): I am well, thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Good. Welcome.

Mr. Jamieson: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Whenever you are ready.

Mr. Jamieson: I feel like I am following Will Rogers here. A copy of my presentation was photocopied. I believe you all have it.

Mr. Chairman: Yes. We do indeed.

* (2030)

Mr. Jamieson: When I went through it after I got it back, I realized that it is full of errors, omissions and some areas where my thinking has overtaken what I had written down, so I will ask that you follow me instead of the document you have and, hopefully, I will make more sense than it does.

The panel has already heard people suggesting that the Senate should be abolished or that it should become a Triple-E Senate or that something else should be done about it. For an organization that has been considered to be useless for the last 125 years, you are probably going to spend a lot of time hearing about the Senate, and I am going to present an idea on the Senate myself.

I do not believe that a Triple-E Senate is really the answer, for a number of reasons. I think that to make each province equally represented in the Senate is unrealistic. I think it is unrealistic to suggest that Prince Edward Island should have the same power as Quebec or that Manitoba should have the same power as Ontario. I think also to make it elected and effective is, as someone has already said this evening, going to do little more than create another layer of legislative power that will simply confuse matters even further than they already are and make it more difficult to get legislation passed. It will also not really answer any of the questions or problems that are facing Canada, I think, at this time.

My proposal centres on a restructuring of the Senate in a manner which might address the issues of minority representation to Government as well as the appropriate disposition of powers between the senior levels of Government. The notion here involves a restructuring both in the way that people are appointed or come to the Senate and in the powers of the Senate.

Essentially I have a rather complicated formula for deciding how many persons each province should

have in the Senate. If one takes the total population of the province, divides by 100,000 and then takes the square root of that number, rounds it up to the next highest number and then triples the total, essentially that would give, for example, Prince Edward Island a total of six representatives in the Senate. It would give the Province of Ontario 30 representatives in the Senate.

By applying the square root principle, essentially what you do is you recognize that a province with a large population should have a higher representation, but you damp down the power that province has and, in so doing, you enhance the power of the smaller provinces, so that Prince Edward Island, which currently has four out of 298 seats in the House of Commons, becomes a province that has six out of 150 seats by this particular formula. It has a little bit more power, a little bit more impact. Ontario, on the other hand, is reduced from having one-third of the representation in the Commons to having one-fifth of the representation in this particular House, so its power has been damped down a little bit and, as a result, the smaller provinces have a greater say.

Of the seats thus created, one-third of them would be appointed by the federal power, one-third of them would be appointed by the provincial power, and the remaining third would be distributed amongst representatives of minority groups. Indians, Metis, English within Quebec, Francophones outside of Quebec, the handicapped and substantial ethnic minorities would be assigned the power to appoint their representatives to the Senate, and they would form one-third of the Senate.

It is my opinion that a part of the problem that Canada faces is that its minorities are too often ignored. In elected Houses, they are usually unable to put representatives into elected Houses with any degree of consistency. We have in Manitoba—and are fortunate to have, I think—representatives of the aboriginal peoples in the Legislative Assembly, but that is rare and is certainly not something we can count on happening consistently. I do not believe that we have anyone who can be said to represent, for example, handicapped people in the Legislative Assembly or in any elected body in Canada, and I think that those people have to be heard from. So that would be my proposal for restructuring the way that people come to the Senate.

I would propose that the powers of the Senate be quite severely limited from what they are now, that the Senate would, one, be the keeper of the Canadian Constitution. It would have the power to review legislation, both federal and provincial, to ensure that that legislation is within the Constitution. It would have the power to consider constitutional amendment, but could only pass such amendments with a 70 percent majority of the people sitting in the Senate and a 50 percent majority of each provincial caucus. In that way the rights of the provinces and the power of the federal Government is respected and maintained.

Because of their influence over the Constitution, I would suggest that the Senate should also have the authority to appoint justices to the Federal Court at all levels and to the Supreme Court of Canada. While the actual making of a Constitution is the province of politicians, the interpreting of that Constitution, the determining of how it works, is the province of the courts. So I believe that a body that is to be the keeper of the Constitution should have the authority to appoint to the Bench in order to ensure that interpretation is also carried out in a manner that is consistent with the wishes of that body.

Finally, and most importantly, I think the Senate would become the ultimate arbiter of national standards for federally-funded programs. It is important that those national standards be set with input, not only from the federal power, but also with input from the provincial power, which the Senate would have. The federal power wants to set a high standard for national programs; the provincial power wants to set an achievable standard for provincial programs, and hopefully those two powers would be able to compromise within a Senate structured as this one would be.

I would propose that senators be appointed either for a term certain or to a specific retirement age and that they could not be reappointed for a second term. Thus the Senate could set standards and consider the effects of their decisions into the long term without having to consider whether their current decisions will affect their reelection or reappointment. That is the proposal that I have.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Carr: This is a very interesting and innovative idea, which I think most of us are being introduced to for the first time. One question I have is regarding how one would amend the Constitution. You are giving the Senate the power to appoint justices who would interpret the Constitution, but you say that Constitution making is the province of the politicians. How would the Constitution be changed? Would it be changed by those who are responsible for its

interpretation or the politicians who are responsible for its construction?

* (2040)

Mr. Jamieson: Essentially the politicians, as I say, are responsible for its making. The judges are responsible for its interpretation and deciding what the nuts and bolts are, how this Constitution will actually work. Now, I am not quite sure of your question, but if I am interpreting it correctly, you are saying, how would we take the power to appoint Section 96 judges away from the Minister of Justice? Am I interpreting you wrongly?

Mr. Carr: No. That would be an interesting question, but I am interested in the competing powers or the complementary powers that you are giving the politicians, the elected ones, to make the Constitution and the senators, whose only responsibility really is to make sure that it is interpreted and interpreted properly. If the Constitution is to be changed, if it is to be amended, how does that happen and who is responsible for it?

Mr. Jamieson: Essentially, what I would propose is that a constitutional amendment could be brought forward from the Commons or from any of the provincial Legislatures and put before the Senate for consideration. Then the Senate, as I say, would have to accept that amendment with a 70 percent majority and with a 50 percent majority in each of the provincial caucuses and then that amendment would become law.

Mr. Carr: Each of the provincial caucuses within the provinces or within the House of Commons?

Mr. Jamieson: Each province would have the authority to put a certain number of senators or at least there would be a certain number of senators originating from each province. Pardon me while I go back and start again. There would be a certain number of senators originating from each province, one-third of them appointed by the federal Government, one-third by the province itself and one-third by the minority groups as I discussed earlier. Fifty percent of the senators from each province would have to accept the amendment in order to have it brought into law. If the Senate caucus from a single province rejected the amendment or could only get 49 percent of its Members to vote in favour of it, then that amendment would die.

Mr. Carr: So it is a kind of unanimity because you would need double majorities both within the Senate itself and within each caucus which represents the provinces in the Senate.

Mr. Jamieson: That is correct. That would be my proposal.

Mr. Carr: Okay.

Mr. Praznik: My only question for you is a very short and simple one. With such a formula, are you a math teacher by chance? Or an engineer?

Mr. Jamieson: No. In fact, I am a lawyer. Incidentally, you mentioned that this was a new notion to you. I have been presenting this at constitutional conferences for 10 years.

Mr. Praznik: Very interesting. Thank you.

Ms. Friesen: I was interested, at the end of your presentation, when you talked about one of the major functions of this reformed Senate would be the definition of maintenance of national standards. I wonder if you could elaborate on that, why have you selected that as one of its major roles and what range of national standards are you talking about?

Mr. Jamieson: I am referring to national standards for programs such as Medicare, essentially the type of program where the federal Government is granting money to the province and saying: Here it is, now we want you to put into effect a program in the area of universal health care. For example, and the reason that I am suggesting that is, firstly, because there does have to be a national standard for those programs; and secondly, because I believe that at this time we have the federal Government setting those standards without adequate input from the provinces. The standards are either not being set at all when they should be, or they are being set at a level that the provinces find very difficult to meet on the amount of money that they are getting.

So the Senate has input from the provinces; the provinces can come and say the standard that we have is too high, that we cannot meet it. It also has input from the federal Government and from the people who are most commonly the users of that program, representatives of the minority groups and, specifically with medicare, the handicapped, and they are sitting there saying: These are the standards that we want, we want a very high standard, the federal Government is prepared to go along with a very high standard and we are prepared to negotiate with the provincial representatives to establish an achievable standard, but we are not going to go right down to the bottom, we are not going to give away the standard.

Ms. Friesen: So you would say that national

standards are your goal and that the reformed Senate is one of the means to that end?

Mr. Jamieson: One of the means to that end, that is correct.

Ms. Friesen: The second thing I wanted to ask you about was you identified in the early part of your discussion one of the factors, obviously, that has faced Canadians for many generations, is the fundamental tensions between French and English in Canada.

Mr. Jamieson: Essentially that was one of the ones that I skipped over because, as I say, later thinking had overtaken that. How would this address the Quebec issue, though? I take it is your question.

Ms. Friesen: Yes, do you see it as one step amongst many, and if so, what other ones would you look at?

Mr. Jamieson: Well, frankly, I do not think that this does address the issue of Quebec; I do not think that we have a formula that can address the issue of Quebec. Quebec, for better or for worse, is the homeland of the French-speaking people in Canada. If they decide that it cannot be a homeland within Canada, then they will decide that it will be a homeland outside of Canada and we here in Manitoba are not going to do much to change that, I do not believe. As I say, I do not think that this addresses that issue because I do not think that anything can address that issue aside from the Quebecois themselves.

Ms. Friesen: Okay, thanks.

Mrs. Render: In the concept of the Triple-E Senate, one of the E's, of course, stands for equal. I notice in your presentation that you suggest that it would be unrealistic to suggest that P.E.I., or one of the smaller provinces, have the same equal representation as one of the larger provinces. If I understand you correctly, you are saying, then, that there just should not be a concern for the smaller, less populace province to have an equal voice in the Senate then. You are not addressing that particular concern with your formula here?

Mr. Jamieson: I am saying that it is unrealistic to suggest—whether they should be equal or not, I do not think really is the issue. The issue is whether or not Ontario would, for example, sit down with P.E.I. or sit down with Manitoba and say, yes, we consider you to be an equal within the Confederation. I think it much more likely that they would sit down with these provinces and say, we are prepared to deal with you, we are prepared to bring you up and maybe bring us down, but when push comes to shove, you are not equal to us. We are 10 times the population that you are, we are more than 10 times the economic resource than you are, and when push comes to shove, we are going to scream louder than you can, and we are going to have our institution created expressly so that we can do that. When Manitoba has 10 million people in it, you can come to the table with Ontario as an equal, until then you cannot.

Mrs. Render: That formula works for the House of Commons, but you do not see a different formula being used for the Senate then? In other words, if the population remains small, we are stuck? Our voice is not going to be as powerful as our next door neighbour?

Mr. Jamieson: Essentially, there is—in the formula that is presented in the paper—a serious omission. The omission there is the notion of taking the square root of the population divided by 100,000.

Mrs. Render: You have lost me there.

Mr. Jamieson: Okay. Essentially, the formula as presented in the paper would really simply create another House of Commons.

Mrs. Render: That is what it appears, yes.

Mr. Jamieson: What was intended, and what has been omitted, is the idea of taking the population, divide by 100,000—so what you have starts to look like the House of Commons—then take the square root of that number. If you have a very large province like Ontario, when you take the square root of that population, divide it by 100,000, you end up with the number 10. You do not end up with the number 98, you end up with this much smaller number. When you take the square root of the population of Prince Edward Island and round it up to the next whole number, you have the number two. Relatively speaking, Prince Edward Island has become more powerful relative to Ontario.

Ontario still has the largest number of seats and the largest number of votes, but cannot dominate proceedings in a Senate structured in this way as it can in the House of Commons because it has a third of the Members there. It has a much smaller percentage of the Members in a House structured in this particular way. We do not have equality, but we have reduced the ability of one province to dominate the other nine. Actually, in the House of Commons, Quebec and Ontario together can pass any legislation they want; they have more than 50 percent of the Members. Whereas in the Senate, structured in this particular way, they would not be able to do that.

Mr. Chairman: But neither do they in the present Senate, sir. There are only 24 seats in Ontario and 24 seats in Quebec in the present Senate.

Mr. Jamieson: That is correct.

Mr. Chairman: In fact, you are increasing their representation in the Senate by your formula, are you not?

Mr. Jamieson: No, I think if you work through the numbers you will find that we are decreasing their representation. This formula would result in a Senate of 150 Members. Ontario and Quebec together would have only 54 of those Members. Relatively speaking, their authority has been decreased.

* (2050)

Mr. Chairman: Well, I think it would be very helpful for us if you would revise your paper, because there are quite substantial differences between what you said and what is in the printed word. If you could send us the revision, we would be very glad to see it.

Mr. Jamieson: Very well, I will do that. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McCrae.

Mr. McCrae: To be fair to Mr. Jamieson, he warned us about that when he started, about—

Mr. Chairman: Indeed, he did. I think it would be very helpful for us to have the revised paper.

Mr. McCrae: I am going to do something dangerous and go to that brief that you have prepared and ask you a question on what is on the paper perhaps, as opposed to what you have said. I want to ask you what you mean by constitutional validity when you refer to one of the jobs or powers or duties of the Senate being "the power to review both federal and provincial legislation only to consider its constitutional validity and for no other purpose." Can you explain what you mean by that for me?

Mr. Jamieson: Essentially, the Senate would have the job of determining whether or not this legislation falls within one of the—for example, if it were provincial legislation—and I know that you would never do this—but you purported to appoint a judge with the powers of a Queen's Bench Court Judge, that legislation would go to the Senate. They would be able to say, well, Section 96 of the BNA Act which is still the dominant section regarding division of powers, does not allow you to do that, so we will disallow this legislation, but they could not get into the questions of partisanship or the questions of policy that underlie that legislation.

Mr. McCrae: Is that not what judges do now, tell us what we are doing wrong with our legislation? You are saying that the Senate should take that role. I take it these senators do not have to be lawyers. It seems to me what you are doing is asking the Senate to perform the same function as the judges that you are saying the Senate ought to be appointing.

Mr. Jamieson: But the judges are only going to do that if somebody challenges your legislation. If no one challenges your legislation then that unconstitutional legislation remains on the books, may be acted on for five or six years to the detriment of some and to the benefit of others, and then five or six years down the road be declared by the Supreme Court to be unconstitutional.

Another example and one that may come a little bit closer to home, the legislation regarding the suspending of the—

Mr. McCrae: Impoundment of vehicles?

Mr. Jamieson: Yes. I am sorry. The impoundment of vehicles for a person who is picked up as a suspended driver which is provincial legislation, that is being challenged through the courts. If it is found to be constitutional, all well and good. If it is found to be unconstitutional, then it has been on the books and a number of people have suffered as a result. Now, what the Senate would do is simply prevent unconstitutional legislation from getting on the books in the first place.

Mr. Chairman: Thanks very much, sir. We will look forward to your revised copy.

Mr. Jamieson: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: We are going to take a short break, ladies and gentlemen. We will be back at nine o'clock, five minutes from now.

* * *

The committee took recess at 8:55 p.m.

After Recess

The committee resumed at 9:06 p.m.

Mr. Chairman: All right, ladies and gentlemen, I think if I start probably I will be joined by the rest. Our next presenter is Mr. George Clark. Mr. Clark? The next presenter, Ms. Marion Campbell. Ms. Marion Campbell.

Ms. Marion Campbell (Private Citizen): Hello.

Mr. Chairman: Hello, Ms. Campbell. We have your written presentation.

Ms. Campbell: Thank you. Well, I should have had my collar on backwards tonight, but I forgot. Anyhow, I will start out.

In the Lord's Prayer we pray, "Thy will be done on Earth as it is in heaven." Do we mean business when we pray this? You do not hear much of that from Parliament, either provincial or federal.

Most of God's law is found in the Old Testament. I have a Bible at home that I bought at a book sale. The New Testament is ragged with wear, but the Old is almost in new condition.

The sacrificial laws were put away with Christ's death, but the commandments, statutes and judgments remain, contrary to what a lot of churches preach. In fact, they keep off it pretty well.

The law was given in Adam's day, which began 4000 B.C. Adam was created 4000 B.C., according to the chronological tables that you find in religious literature. A man this morning said we started out 25000 B.C., I think it was, but anyway that is neither here nor there for now.

The reason God chose Adam was that he obeyed God's laws. Abraham was called to found a new nation in 1921 B.C. The reason God chose him was that he obeyed his laws.

Moses was given the same law to teach the descendants of Abraham and Sarah 430 years later. We get more detail from that time than in the earlier writings.

It is interesting to note these dates. We are inclined to think these laws are millions of years old and have little to do with today.

The law of animal sacrifices was not given until the time of Moses. At the time of Christ's death, the Apostles had a hard time convincing people that that law was passed. They did not have radio, TV, trains and cars in those days.

The laws are divided into four categories. There are the commandments and rules for personal conduct; there are statutes for the organization of Government; the economic laws, that is, the regulation of business, agriculture, commerce, foreign relations, crime control, health, social regulations, et cetera, in other words the national, civil, criminal and political laws.

* (2110)

The next section of the laws were the judgments, in various forms, the most common being the penalty or sentence God requires the state to impose on the criminal.

The fourth section that was added later on was the ordinances. This is the part that was abolished when Christ sacrificed his life. They were the religious laws, the laws of sacrifice, offerings and ceremonies. These were the laws that were added because of transgressing the law.

Two-sevenths of the Bible deals with religion, and five-sevenths is history, prophecy and, importantly, national instructions. They have been passed by because of the belief that Jesus fulfilled and abolished the whole law.

This error has robbed us of the fullness of God's blessing on our Christian nations; because of honouring part of His will, we have been partly blessed.

The Christian nations, you might notice in the world, have far better lives than any other country has or any other group of people. It is because we have been half good and half bad.

To get down to the matter at hand tonight, I will tell you something of the laws given.

The commandment says—this is the one concerning theft. The law is: Thou shalt not steal. If a man steal an ox or a sheep and kill it or sell it, he shall restore five oxen for an ox and four sheep for a sheep. If the theft be certainly found in his hand alive, whether it be ox or ass or sheep, he shall restore only double, if he has not already killed it or sold it. If he has nothing, he cannot give it back; then he shall be sold for theft. If these laws of restitution were enforced in America today, it would cut theft in all of its forms. I guess they do not mean he is sold permanently, but he is sold until he has paid off the ox or whatever he stole.

In other matters of taxes, the only tax should be on your income, not on your home or any of your purchases and that kind of thing. It is to be 10 percent of our income. Some religious organizations ask for a tithe or 10 percent of your income, but in the law the 10 percent—1 percent of that was for the priests, and the 9 percent was for running your country. The 9 percent of your income is what we should be taxed with, and it should cover all things relating to Government. As far as any cause that you wish to give to, free will offerings are always welcome.

It says here, we have gone aside, to the left, from the commandments and the United States—this is an American thing I am reading here, but it applies to Canada too—would practically become a welfare state which is a form of socialism. Welfare statism is the inner decay that destroys republics and free

enterprise and that smothers the creative and productive spirit of man. Welfare statism is dependent on massive federal spending, which in turn demands a high rate of taxation. Thus we have the simple paradox of the people buying their own economic slavery. Divine law prevents such economic slavery by the simple expedient of limited taxation. The divine law does not permit a debt buildup to be inherited by the next generation, for all debts must be liquidated or cancelled every seventh year.

Now we go on to agriculture. We are told that the lands should lie fallow every seventh year to maintain soil fertility. It is promised a good enough crop the sixth year to last until the harvest in the eighth year. The farmer would have his year of rest and the surpluses would be used up.

This is a quotation from Leviticus: If you walk in my statutes and keep my commandments and do them, then I will give you rain in due season, and the land shall yield her increase, and the trees of the field shall yield their fruit. But if you will not hearken unto me and will not do all these commandments, your land shall not yield her increase. Neither shall the trees of the land yield their fruits.

There are monopolies and trusts. They are condemned. Anti-trust laws have their roots in divine law. It says: Woe unto them that join house to house, that lay field to field, till there is no place, that they may be placed alone in the midst of the earth. I guess that means you are not supposed to be too big a businessman. God speaks through the prophet Isaiah, condemns monopolies, conglomerates, chain stores, corporate farms, and other combines whose operations bring a disproportionate share of the wealth under the control of a few or which strangle competition. It is God's plan that all citizens share in the wealth of the nation, not by dole nor federally guaranteed family income programs, but by opportunity and initiative.

Micah 4 says, but they shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree and none shall make them afraid, for the mouth of the Lord of hosts hath spoken it. That will come to pass, and I have told that to people in the—I sometimes go to the ARC Industries where the people are mentally handicapped, and I told them this, that they will be under their own vine and under their own fig tree some day, that they are not condemned for life to have to be depending on other people.

Okay, so that is that page, and then there is another one about keeping the Sabbath. The blessings are promised in Isaiah 56, and I was going to say—my own experience here, I phoned this Star Country—you probably listen to the radio sometimes after midnight. I do when I cannot sleep; I turn on the radio, and for a while I used to listen to this Star Country. It is country music that they play all night long, seven nights a week. I do not like country music that much but anyway so I phoned in there, they have a toll free number you can phone in, and I phoned and asked the fellow if they ever played any gospel music. He said no, there is not much call for it. That is Sunday and all, and there is no call for it.

About the same time that I phoned in there the country awards were on, and Dolly Parton got a standing ovation for a long gospel song. It is strange, like on the Sunday we are not supposed to do anything. We are supposed to rest. Like an old man said to me, you should go just flat out on Sunday, do not do anything, and I do not mind that at all. It is funny, something that we do not have to put any effort into, well, we will not do it. We have bingo games and political meetings and hockey and everything on Sunday. Some work their heads off.

Is that 20 minutes off? Have I gotten through my 20 minutes? We are told when we elect politicians they are to be men of ability such as fear God.

Then the health laws—you may not have known it; I did not until lately until I happened onto it that when the animals were put on the ark there were seven pair of clean animals and one pair of unclean animals put on. The unclean animals are named, and the clean ones are named. The clean animals are cattle, venison, sheep, goats, and no fat is to be eaten even of the clean animals.

The unclean are horse, and they say they eat a lot of that in Iceland, camels, they like to eat that in the Middle East, especially pork, pork is really condemned in several places as is rabbits. Seafood with fins and scales is clean, but the unclean animals are oysters, shrimp, clams and scallops, et cetera. The birds are listed too, and then for health is sanitation and isolation.

Even worse than the food we eat is the diet we get from the media, which should be ours, but is largely controlled by non-Christians. I have a leaflet to prove it, that if any of you want tonight I will give you. I have already given some.

* (2120)

Edward Taylor of Thompson in a letter to the editor

of the Winnipeg Free Press some time ago wrote the following: Have you any idea how many loads of garbage a week it takes to supply the CBC? I am sure it takes a load alone for sprockets. That is some program I do not know anything about.

We have the best teaching tool the world has ever had, our TVs and radios. Since the Iraq war I turned them off to get something more cheerful, but mostly it is violence on TV and so-called country music with "I ain't this," and "I ain't got nothing" and all this stuff. We could certainly use a referendum on the media. It should be a thing that the listeners have some say in.

In the military we are told not to form alliances with foreigners like the SEATO, Southeast Asia Treaty Association. That is why the U.S. got involved in Vietnam in the war, and all men of age 30 were to have military training with the exception of people who were building a house or a business, or just were married or fainthearted. They were to be able to choose their own officers, and then there is just one last thing. -(interjection)- I am finished, am I? Okay, that is fine. I am willing to quit.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you very much, Ms. Campbell. Are there any questions from the task force? Thank you again. Good night.

Mr. Bill Bassett (Private Citizen): Good evening. Ladies and gentlemen, I got a ride or I would not have come up here.

To start with, I was in the army for several years during World War II, and I was stationed on the East Coast. I was brought up in Toronto, and after the war we tried living in Toronto. It did not work out; we moved West. Then I started railroading and I led a gypsy's life. I was in 38 places in 36 years. This is the last one, and my last posting before retirement was in Dauphin. I find this a nice place, so I stayed here.

About Canada—I have been from coast to coast, and after retiring I went right up into Alaska through the Yukon. We do not know what a wonderful country we have. We have not got a country, really. We have an empire. A lot of the great empires of old were a lot smaller than our country of Canada is, and we have everything. Except some people are trying to foment bad feelings among us, and that is too bad.

In my travels I have noted that communities of mixed ethnic origin are thriving. Those who say, only I am good, only I am right, that community starves. I would hate to see our country split. The more diversity we have, there might be more friction, but the better ideas live and they help the community. For that reason alone, I would hate to see Quebec leave, and the ephemeral thing that, only we are right and only we know how to govern if we did.

Now one thing that got me upset was when a talk-show host, Peter Warren, was hooked up with Montreal and St. John's, and somebody from Montreal, speaking a good English, said that the Indians are not citizens of Canada because they never fought in any of our wars. Now, I was in Grade 8, I had an instructor who was a British military man. He said, in World War I the command post of the battalion had to send messages out to the field. They could not use radio; the Germans would hear. They could not use the land telephone, because in no man's land the Germans had plugged into it, and it would be too difficult and long to send a cryptic message.

What they did, they had Indians in their outfit who were not from a major tribe but from a small tribe relatively unknown. They had one Indian in the command post and the other one at the battery end, and they communicated to each other in their native language and everything worked out fine. Then you hear this man from Montreal saying, no Indian has ever fought in Canadian wars. I wonder where he got his information from. What kind of history did he learn?

I was in Saskatchewan one time. I was living there in this particular place six years. The principal there had his education in Quebec City, and we were talking about Canadian history. Now Canadian history is something that should be the same all over Canada. I do not care what language you use. Our country was developed as one country. He said, you know if you were to take the history I learned and the history I am teaching here in Saskatchewan, not only will you not believe that it is the same country, you would not believe it is in the same galaxy.

How may we have unity, if we are coming from different standpoints? I realize education is a provincial responsibility but, by God, when they say that Indians are not citizens because they never fought in a Canadian war, what kind of truth is that? The most decorated soldier in Korea was an Indian from Brokenhead. There are no Indians in my family either historically or through marriage, but I am upset.

In 1990, my daughter took an immersion course at university in the summer, and half the people were from Quebec province, and half the people were from the rest of Canada. One boy—he was going to be a lawyer, so he said—came up with my daughter

and—like a group of them came down to Dauphin. He said, my God, I did not realize Manitoba was this big. He says, in Quebec that the cities are three and four miles apart, and here they rented a car, and they are going and going and going, and all they see are fields. We should have more exchanges and not only between east and west, but also between south and north. The country, the Yukon, is absolutely wonderful. We do not know what we have, and I hate to see it torn apart.

During the Oka confrontation, the military wanted to isolate the Natives, and I do not know who, but somebody came up before a Quebec judge and misrepresented the facts to a judge. He said the Indians planned to blow up bridges in B.C. When something like that did happen—like a bridge did burn in B.C.—that was several weeks before the Oka mess developed, and then he forgot, intentionally forgot to mention that there are media people behind the barricades.

* (2130)

If I were to go up to a judge and make an obscene gesture to him, you know what I would get, but here somebody lies to a judge and nothing happens? Somebody burns a Canadian flag regularly every Tuesday and Thursday pretty near in Quebec province; they do not even charge them with obstructing traffic. Nothing, but what would happen if I was to take a provincial, not a national flag, and desecrate it? In Manitoba we are stricter about that. If you notice the Indians, in spite of all their troubles and provocations from the military, they never destroyed a flag of either Quebec or of Canada.

Then the educational system: It should be that people are taught in their own native language. We have Eskimos. The Russians have Eskimos. Before the Second World War to say anything nice about the Russians was to be a subversive. Then all of a sudden Russia becomes an ally of ours, and they are trying to counteract the propaganda of the decades, that Russia was our ally, their country, climate is the same and everything.

It was in the Toronto Daily Star that an Eskimo of Russia went and became an air ace by shooting down five German planes. Now they are the same Eskimos that we have in Canada. How many Canadian Eskimos were flying in the Royal Canadian Air Force? How come the Russians could train their Eskimos to be citizens like that, and we cannot? I do not believe that the Russians are any better than we are, nor are we any better than the Russians, but something is wrong when a part of our population does not have an education in their own language that they can feel comfortable with. There is something wrong when justice depends on who you are instead of what your condition is.

That is all I have to say.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you very much, sir. Any questions? Thanks again Mr. Bassett. Mr. Wynes.

Mr. Jim Wynes (Private Citizen): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, sir, and welcome.

Mr. Wynes: Thank you. I do not have any brief to present to you. All I have got is a few cards that I wrote on after I got here. However, this little presentation is made on the premise that Quebec is going to separate. It is going to whether we want it or not. It may not be this year, next year or 10 years from now, but they are going.

I believe that the rest of Canada should have a process in place, and I suppose that this meeting is part of that process, but a small one. A process should be in place, and it should be in place fairly soon before all the type of thing that is evolving from this meeting is determined, but who is going to speak for the rest of Canada? I am sure that no one that I know of wants the present Prime Minister and his, what I might term, despicable cabal to do that for us. They are without doubt the worst Government we have had, and it is banal and duplicitous. They lack ethics; I could go on for quite a few more adjectives. No one that I know would trust him or any of his Quebec Members, or for that matter any of his dutiful backbenchers, to represent the western position on constitutional reform. The possibility makes me shudder.

This commission is a step in the right direction. The Meech Lake hearings gave overwhelming support to rejection of Quebec's stand in the Meech Lake fiasco, and it also gave overwhelming support to no special status for Quebec. My own presentation at that time was to the effect that no one had a right to a distinct identity which would have to be supported, directly or indirectly, by Government. That is still my position, especially in regard to multiculturalism. There is no place in Canada for a distinct society of any kind, and this applies regardless of whether you came over on a land bridge from Asia, or the last one of Ms. McDougall's refugee boats from Sri Lanka, no one should be allowed to be better than someone else, they should not have special status. That does not

mean to say that you should not help them, you should, but not in that fashion.

Now, in your brochure you talk about aboriginal concerns. I have not got the answer to this at all, I do not know what it is, but boy am I mad. There is $4 billion or $5 billion a year spent to support Natives which, in itself, is fine as long as it does not get any more. It should be capped, but the taxpayers of the country are tied to this forevermore; to be tied to such an indenture is wrong, time has passed them by. When the federal Government supplies $128 million to Native post-secondary education, where is the justice when a non-Native student graduates and is tied for three or four years of student loans and still has to pay for the education of the next generation of Native post-secondary people, as well as the $4 billion or $5 billion I mentioned?

I do not consider that the Natives are the only people who are able to take advantage of the system. We have in Ottawa the House of Commons and the Senate, who, it appears, consider themselves a distinct society. They have an outrageous, an obscene pension plan which pays them benefits beyond belief. I mention this because in my own case, and for that matter in Mr. Bassett's case, we have no indexing of pensions on the CNR. Oh, sure, lately they have been forced to give us about $20 for the past 20 years, not cumulative, but per month. It should have been somewhere closer to, in my case, probably $1,500, but that is another story.

The Members of Parliament are responsible for the operation of the CNR and for their pensions—this is just an example, it is just one of them—and yet they did not do one thing about it, but it did not stop them from indexing their own pensions after six years. They cannot say that they did not know about it, they did. I have written to many Members of Parliament over 25 years. On the 1975 hearings I told them what I thought, and in the 1985 hearings I told them again what I thought. It took until 1989 for the Supreme Court to tell them the same thing—that they were wrong. I called them liars, cheats and thieves in all instances, and nobody corrected me.

Also, the Senate is modelled on the House of Lords more or less. Incidentally, the House of Lords does not pay its Members. As I see it, Senate reform should entail a vote for senators on a provincial basis. I believe that someone this afternoon held that up, and I believe it was the gentleman last before we recessed. It should entail a vote for senators on a provincial basis, and as an added feature, they could be elected on years alternating with a Commons vote and only two or three senators per province. Stan Waters is an example of the quality of people you would get in something like that, and I do not believe that he is overly partisan.

* (2140)

I also believe that multiculturalism and bilingualism are very divisive. Each and every language should look after itself. It should be looked after by those who want to save it. Someone here tonight mentioned the Ukrainian group in Dauphin, and they have looked after their language very, very well with a very minimum of Government assistance.

Now, Dr. Ritchie mentioned immigration. As of April 1, we have an immigration policy overwhelmingly slanted toward Francophone immigrants. There are many hundreds of millions of dollars scheduled for French language instruction to these people. I forget what it was, it was in the paper, 600 million or something, and this is predominantly for the French immigrants. They said so in the paper. This cost will not be shown as a cost for bilingualism. It will be shown as a cost in the Immigration Department.

Dr. Ritchie mentioned that immigrants should be asked whether they want to join us; so they should. If they do not want to, send them back. Immigrants should either subscribe to the mores of our country or be turned back. We now have members of the RCMP allowed on a religious basis to wear religious icons. Soon we will be walking down the street and dodging the mess made by holy cows. We must make sure that the majority people's language is respected. The RCMP still sends Anglos to Montreal to learn French. In this day when Quebec wants separation, the question is, why?

We must have a fixed date for successive federal elections, and I suggest four years. It should not be at the whim of the Prime Minister. We must have a right of recall for politicians, some of whom manage to export 226,000 good jobs to the maquiladoras.

It may be time for a charter of responsibilities. I believe that one of the presenters had a presentation here tonight on reform of the Senate, and it was well-thought out, but personally I think it would amount to a Tower of Babel.

That is all I have. Thank you for your consideration.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, sir. Any questions? Thank you again.

Mr. Dean Lawryniuk (Private Citizen): Hello.

Mr. Chairman: How are you, sir?

Mr. Lawryniuk: Fine, thanks.

Mr. Chairman: Good.

Mr. Lawryniuk: I would like to say that I appreciate the opportunity of being able to speak on an issue that I found very frustrating all summer, through the death of Meech Lake, through Oka, through all of the things that our country has gone through this past year. I found it frustrating to be silent and only to be able to talk over the phone to friends who thought likewise. I feel very strongly that this sort of forum is important for a variety of reasons.

I would like to come not with a very well-prepared presentation; I would like to come simply as a fan of Canada. I am so tired of people beating up on it. It has so many things to offer, and I know this is going to sound a little bit Pollyanna, but the country has done so many things so very well. It has been fair to its citizens. It has tried in many, many ways to accommodate the differences in culture and language. It is worth fighting for. Sea to sea to sea is a concept that I like not because it is a particularly good piece of real estate, but also because it has afforded us—it is such a big space that we have been able to co-exist in it and live in it with our differences and be an example to the rest of the world that the rest of the world likes very much.

During these hostilities in the other parts of the world, people have looked to Canadians and, unfortunately, we have changed our posture, but I think that is an aberration. I think this Government in Ottawa has made many mistakes, not the least of which is the handling of our Constitution, but also in changing our posture as a helper in the world and a peacekeeper and a country that tried to do good and constructive things in the way of peace and supporting human rights.

I come to this table tonight to say that I like Quebec in Canada. I want it to stay. I think we are reasonable people. I think if we look hard and try hard, we will find a way to do it. I do not accept the idea that we should simply accept the fact that they are going to leave. They should not leave. We should try and find a way. We are better than that. We fought in a war together. I know there were debates about who should go to the last war, the Second World War, and who really gave their sons and all that, but the fact of the matter is, dissent is a good thing. I am happy that our French population has spoken its mind in the Second World War and contributed as it did and as it felt it could.

I would like to move from that and now look at what a Constitution should offer us as Canadians. I think our Constitution should not merely be a limit of rights. I think our Constitution should be something we look at and say yes, that reminds me of what it is to be a Canadian. There should be a component of that Constitution that says, these are the good things about being Canadian, and I am reminded of that when I look at the Constituion, and I am determined to be a part of that Constitution as a Canadian, whether I am from Quebec, from Manitoba, from British Columbia.

I do not trust the provincial Premiers. I do not trust provincial Governments to look out for the greater good of Canadians. I know they have their local concerns that they have to look to and they have to defend. In a have-not province like Manitoba—having travelled to Ontario and seeing what their health care is like, having travelled to British Columbia and seeing what they have by way of infrastructure and industry, et ceters, trust me, in Manitoba we are a have-not province and we are getting less. I have a problem with that.

That is an aside, but what I want in this Constitution or any proposal that you come up with, I want it to have a component that helps us define who we are, not simply as a reaction to Americans, not simply as people who find particular ways of coping in crisis, whatever that crisis is.

As a remedy to the situation that we find ourselves in, I suggest this, that if our politicians have all this good information, they have all these good consultants, they have done all this powerful polling, they have these great machines behind them, I am calling on all three of them, I am calling you out. Come and propose your three Constitutions, Liberal, Conservative and New Democratic. Develop processes on your own. Whatever process you need to develop a model and a constitution, find it, discover it and then put it before the people in a federal election and let people vote.

It seems like it is the only thing we can do, to wait for Senate reform, to wait for a variety of things; it takes your breath away, because you know it will never happen, or it seems like it will never happen.

I am calling on Brian Mulroney to have some guts. Let us have a federal election. Let us have each of the three Parties come with a platform centred around a constitution that they think is fair, that represents Canadians, that shows us who we are. Let the people decide about whether the process that those Parties

used to make that proposal is fair. Let the politicians in those Parties be creative. Let them go back to their constituencies and find out what is important and then come to a federal election and let us vote on it. That would be, I think, a fair way to decide on what is important to Canadians.

* (2150)

I want to speak just for a moment on bioulturalism and multiculturalism. I am Ukrainian. I am a first-generation Ukrainian. I should say I am Canadian, obviously, but my parents both came from the Ukraine. I am the first one to go to a Canadian university. I was the first one to do everything in Canada, have no part outside Canada, and I want to say that our community and the people I grew up with were afforded the opportunity to maintain the integrity of that culture and that community I think because there was bioulturalism. Because there was the French and Canadian fact, I think Canadians were more lenient. I think we were afforded more opportunities, and I am very thankful.

My children now, I will have the choice of sending them to a bilingual school, Ukrainian-English, or trilingual, French, English and Ukrainian—anything I want. Frankly, my choice will be to educate them in French and English, but I am very happy for the fact that our country was so understanding and so generous that we were given that opportunity as a community. I am a product of that community, and I now have the opportunity to make those choices. I do not think bioulturalism was a bad bargain. I think it was a good thing and I think we have all benefited from it.

I would like to wrap it up by saying that at the end of the whole process this summer of watching all the things that went on TV, in the press, et cetera, and in watching the polls and watching Peter Mansbridge and all those other talking heads on TV, we all sat back and said: You know we are really upset with our politicians. There seems to be a lack of ideas; there seems to be a lack of imagination in developing process. This is a step, but I am challenging you as representatives of your Parties and of Governments and different parts of society to step back, come up with models and let us vote on it, and find a process of inviting people to participate. I guess that is all I have to say.

Mr. Chairman: I am not sure, just hang tough for a moment, sir, if you will. Thank you very much for that. Are there any questions? Mr. Lathlin has a question to ask you. Will you come back and sit down, sir? Thank you.

Mr. Lathlin: Mr. Lawryniuk, I really do not have a question that I wanted to ask of you, but I wanted to commend you on your presentation, the hope that you have, the vision, the optimism that you display. It is so refreshing to hear you here this evening because I have only been one day or half a day on this task force, and I have heard nothing but negative commentary about the French, the aboriginal people, Canada, politicians, provincial governments and so on. So you gave me quite a boost this evening, and I just wanted you to know that and I wanted to thank you.

I also wanted to comment a little further because I think you have an appreciation just from listening to you for a short while. You see, I know who I am too. I know my roots, I know my history, my culture, but a lot of people unfortunately do not. A lot of people thought we did not go to war. If you look at the per capita, the number of aboriginal people there were in 1939, and if you looked at the numbers of aboriginal people who went to war, based on a per capita against the whole population, there were a tremendous number of aboriginal people in war, both World War I, II and in the Korean conflict. My relatives were some of them. My grandfather was in two wars, the Second World War and then in the Korean conflict. I know who I am, in spite of what I have gone through in my life.

I have no problem whatsoever with the French, with what they are doing, and if the Chairman will permit me to maybe spend a couple of minutes, because I, for one, know full well what it is that they are after.

You see, when I was going to school—and again a lot of people do not know this—when I was going to school, every day I was told that I was no good, that I was dumb, that I was dirty, that I was lazy. Ask any person, if you tell a child right from the time that he is six years old until the time that he is 16, that he is no good, he then by the time he is 16 actually believes that he is dumb, that he is dirty, that he cannot work, that he is not a member of society, that he is inferior. Psychologists will tell you that. Social workers will tell you that. Anybody with a little bit of common sense will tell you that.

I, too, went to school. Every time I spoke my language I was strapped 20 times there, 20 times there, sometimes on my bum. I was never sexually abused, though. I can say that honestly. I was taught by the church, by the Anglican Church. There was a federal policy, and again a lot of people do not know this. Either they choose to ignore it or they do not

want to accept it, because as one presenter said, we do not have a lot of history about aboriginal people. Yet when I went to school, you know what histories I studied? I studied European history. I studied British history, American history, Canadian history. When I studied Canadian history, all I ever found out was how bad the Indian people were, how savage they were.

There was a clear federal policy when tuberculosis was rampant amongst Indian communities, and elders tell us this in The Pas. On a Monday morning, they would ship out 10 people to the sanitarium in The Pas, the airport, and by Friday they would bring home eight bodies, because they were experimenting on aboriginal people on how to treat tuberculosis. That is a fact. Again, a lot of people do not know that.

I have no trouble with the Jewish people. I admire the Jewish people, and yet I know how they are being persecuted. I learned a lot from the Jewish people, because ever since I started to learn their culture and where they are coming from, I started to associate with them, to learn from them, so that I, too, can become strong in spite of what is out there.

* (2200)

I do not have any other motherland that I can go to. You see, I was here. I do not have any ancestral connections to the Ukraine, like yourself, to Poland or to Switzerland or to Germany. This is my motherland, my homeland, and that is why, regardless of what anybody says, I feel quite strongly, and I firmly believe it, that I am a distinct member of Canadian society. I consider myself as a member of Canadian society as well. I am a Canadian, but I am also a member of the First Nations, who were here before.

As far as the money figures that are thrown around, I too did a study about how much money the Department of Indian Affairs, the federal Government, spends on aboriginal people. You know what? I also did another type of a study, where I learned that if you look at the Canadian people in general, and if you compared again on a per capita basis as to how much money is indeed given to aboriginal people, when you look at the universality of programs, when you look at the amount of income tax that big corporations pay—I am a small-business person myself, and all I have to do is get a smart accountant and he can figure out a way for me to get away from paying taxes. So when you bottom-line everything, I think we came up with a figure something like six cents to every dollar as compared to the general population. Again, people do not know that, because they do not bother to find out.

Mr. Chairman, I thought I would close with those remarks. I do not mean to be disrespectful to anybody. I am not better than anybody here. I am just an ordinary person, but I know who I am as well. I still speak my mother tongue, Kapeta, the main one, even though they tried to beat it out of me. I do not know if they ever tried to beat it out of you or anybody else here, but they did not succeed. I know who I am, and the important thing is, I know where I am going.

Thank you for listening to me.

Mr. Chairman: You realize none of that was directed against you, sir, but rather as Mr. Lathlin's, I think, very sympathetic response to what he found to be very positive in what you were saying.

Mr. Lawrynluk: Thanks. Really it is my hope—I look at the Native situation and I clearly do not have a good answer. I do not know, but I always have thought that Canadians have been really ingenious about finding good answers to tough questions across Canada. My hope is that this country will find itself in a position again where it will look hard at trying to find those solutions. I think that is all I would want to say on that. I think we are capable of doing that, and not to throw out the baby with the bath water, not to throw away this country without a Constitution, but rather to try and fit everybody in, accommodating everybody.

Ms. Heather Oberlin (Private Citizen): Hi.

Mr. Chairman: Hi, Ms. Oberlin. Welcome.

Ms. Oberlin: I am not too used to giving public speeches, so bear with me.

Mr. Chairman: Just take it easy and take your time. We look forward to hearing what you have to say.

Ms. Oberlin: Thank you. I believe we must all take a look at where our priorities lie these days, such as education, health care, Native rights, possible Quebec separation, the recession and world peace. It is point form or more or less.

A strong central Government with a long-term economic goal for the good of the country, I believe, is essential. This Government must be accountable to the people which I feel has been lacking definitely in our federal Government lately and somewhat otherwise.

It would seem that once Governments are elected that that is all they have to worry about till the next election in three to five years time. They act like they can do whatever they want in between times, e.g., Mulroney, and I think Trudeau at the end of his reign

as well. He realized he had lost it when he got too involved in trying to set up a constitution. It was more self-fulfillment than necessarily for the good of the country. Now it is definitely for the good of the country. Please do not get me wrong there, but he was wanting to get it accomplished in his term in Government and not necessarily realizing that it could be left for someone else to continue on with.

Let us learn from our past mistakes made by others and not remake them, i.e., privatization. It has not worked very well for Saskatchewan or in Britain. They both are now having to buy back previously privatized companies, so why follow in the same path to higher expenditures later on?

The Governments, provincial and federal, are crying fiscal restraint but seem to be able to afford to line their own pockets quite well when it comes to their own raises, e.g., the MLAs were given COLA or 4 percent to 5 percent. The doctors were given a reasonable settlement, but when it comes to the little people or the working public as in my own case, they offer zero or 2 percent raises and have the audacity to say that there is no money available to the likes of farmers and nurses and whoever else is negotiating with them for contracts, et cetera, at the moment. I find this is all pretty hard to swallow.

Let us control the Government spending, not just wages, please, e.g., corporation taxation. I am happy to see the Government consulting the people who elect it. I hope they will take it seriously, because fortunately people are finally starting a trend to vote with their heads and not just their hearts, which certainly has not always been the case in my point of view.

* (2210)

Public involvement must, I agree, be increased. If we all do our part, it may only be a little and on a personal basis, but it will eventually add up and hopefully slowly set about some much needed changes in our present society. Our future lies with our children and future generations so we, myself as a new parent, must instill good values in our children and trust them to make the choices for us in the future.

It would seem that here tonight, the elders are left to sort out some of the problems. As I see quite a number of older—well, older than myself, anyway—people here and—sort out the problems. As with what I know of the Native community, maybe we need to listen more carefully to their suggestions. Instead of trying to throw them out the window, use the ideas and compromise more so they will have a sense of purpose and respect in knowing that some of the ideas will fit into the picture of our new future together. Isolating them only creates problems as we have already seen. We must be allowed to contribute together, to work out a solution to our provincial, federal and world peace problems.

Mr. Manness today said, and I quote, this Government is committed to making the changes necessary to try and reduce areas of discretionary programming which we feel are no longer apropos in today's reality. I ask that you not cut back in aid programs too heavily because these programs serve as a preventative maintenance measure. If people were better educated to problems such as drunk driving and drugs and family battering, we would not be seeing the rebound effect with these problems and others in today's society to the same extent.

Leaders' debate to inform—okay, this loses a little continuity here. I believe a leaders' debate to inform the public, to allow them to make their own decision, would aid in some of these problems or aid in the process. I hope that people now are more in touch with their own feelings and values and can listen to others a little better.

I have always been proud to be a Canadian; I just hope that I can continue to be so in many different ways. I want to see peace in the world so that my new son can grow up with at least the same chances as I had, the chance for a decent education, to enjoy the beauty of nature, good health, et cetera. These are my reasons for being here tonight, and I hope we can all work together to accomplish this. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you very much. Any questions? Thanks again, Ms. Oberlin.

I, now as our rules provide, will call a couple that did not come forward on first call. Walter Kolisnyk, George Clark. Any others, ladies and gentlemen? Yes, sir.

Mr. Fred Luke (Private Citizen): Good evening, and thanks for this opportunity.

Mr. Chairman: Good evening. Could you give me your name, sir, please?

Mr. Luke: Fred Luke from Dauphin here.

Mr. Chairman: Sorry. Fred Luke.

Mr. Luke: I will be speaking on the subject—I was here this afternoon and now again. I would like to speak on a subject apparently nobody else has had the courage to speak on, because I still maintain that it is really the root source of our problems, because

it is not commonly known that Canada is predominantly Christian; Manitoba is the same; Dauphin is also. Yet we also claim to be the righteous people just like the United States. They are all saying that Hussein is such a bad guy. Well, I agree he is doing wrong, but the thing is we overlook one thing too, which might be our real problem because if we are God-fearing people, then we should look at something else.

What we are doing is—in 1969, May 14, under the able leadership of Pierre Elliott Trudeau and Mr. Turner, and some more cohorts of theirs, they declared open war on the most innocent, the most weakest of our society, the unborn. Since then that example has killed at least a million Canadians already. Now we are around 60,000 per year, yet we say, our Prime Minister says we have to go over there and straighten out Hussein.

Well, I do not think he has killed any more people than what we have in Canada here or United States, for example. President Bush is talking about oh, we have to get rid of him, we have to take him out. Yet the United States kills approximately 2 million of their own every year. They kill more every year than what they have lost in all the skirmishes, whatever, the United States has been involved in over the past 200 years. Canada is doing the same thing.

What I still maintain is this: we are looking for solutions; we are looking for good leadership. I just wonder how many able leaders we have killed. As one person said one time, they might even have killed a whole bunch of good politicians already during the process. What I would still say is that we should get back again to square one and let God take care of these things, not kill our own because this is what is getting us in wrong.

I will not quote any Bible like that lady there was doing because I am not familiar enough with it, but I do know that if we would go to work and clean our own house before we go sweeping somebody else's doorstep, I believe God will take care of us.

We would find a lot less problems, because if you would look back since 1969 almost everything has come apart at the seams in Canada, because of the wrong turn that we made. Everything has gone wrong, because before the railroads would not run on Sundays and nothing was going on Sundays. Now everything is. Even the stores are open now seven days a week, and you will find the people still cannot find enough time to shop, because they just simply, in my opinion—what human society is now is the same as what the Israelites were when Moses went to lead them out of Egypt after they had built their golden calves they were replacing with God. That is when they had to spend 40 years in the desert there because that was their punishment. I kind of figure we will spend more than 40 years of punishment because of what we have done to our own.

I thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, sir. Any questions? Thanks again, Mr. Luke.

Ladies and gentlemen, this brings us to the end of our hearings in Dauphin. We have heard 23 submissions. We only have 27 signed up for Brandon, so you can see that Dauphin has given us some excellent participation. We enjoyed very much your presence and the thoughtfulness that has gone into the presentations this afternoon and this evening. We shall take very seriously what you have told us and what you have written us in your presentations in written form.

Thank you very much for your kindness in coming. It has been a pleasure. Good night.

HEARING ADJOURNED AT: 10:16 p.m..